

NOV 4 1943

THE MONTH

SEPT.-OCT., 1943

Vol. CLXXIX

EIGHTIETH YEAR

No. 935

CONTENTS

	Page
COMMENTS.....By the Editor	313
THE SOUL OF NONCONFORMITY.....By W. E. Orchard	329
MOTIVE-POWER IN OUR SOCIETY.....By W. J. Blyton	340
PORTUGAL UNDER SALAZAR	By Lusofilo 348
CATHOLICS AND THE COMING EDUCATION BILL	
	By John Murray 359
LINDARAXA'S GARDEN (Verse).....By Helen Nicholson	369
MISCELLANEA	370
I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES.	
The New China.	
II. OUR CONTEMPORARIES.	
REVIEWS	377
1.—(1) Midnight Hour. (2) Renascence. Both works by Nicodemus. 2.—The English Carmelites. By Lancelot C. Sheppard. 3.—Mountain Jubilee. By Arnold Lunns. 4.—The World of the Four Freedoms. By Sumner Welles.	
SHORT NOTICES	382

PUBLISHED BY LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LTD.

43 Albert Drive, London, S.W.19

EDITORIAL OFFICES:

114 Mount Street, London, W.1

MANAGER'S ADDRESS:

Manresa Press, Roehampton, S.W.15, to which Annual Subscriptions,
14s. post free (U.S.A. \$3.50), should be sent.

TWO SHILLINGS NET

All rights of translation and reproduction reserved.

CATHOLIC PHILOSOPHY

THE "STONYHURST" TEXT-BOOKS

"—The official intellectualist apologetic which an Englishman may study to great advantage in the remarkably able series of manuals issued by the Jesuits of Stonyhurst."—DEAN INGE, *Outspoken Essays*, Series I., p. 191.

Logic. By Richard F. Clarke, S.J. Second Edition (New Impression). 6s. 6d. net.

First Principles of Knowledge. By John Rickaby, S.J. Fourth Edition. 6s. 6d. net.

Moral Philosophy (Ethics, Deontology and Natural Law). By Joseph Rickaby, S.J. New [Fourth] Edition. 6s. 6d. net.

Natural Theology. By Bernard Boedder, S.J. 6s. 6d. net.

Psychology : Empirical and Rational. By Michael Maher, S.J., D.Litt., and M.A. London. Ninth Edition (forty-eighth to fiftieth thousand). 8s. 6d. net.

General Metaphysics. By John Rickaby, S.J. Third Edition. 6s. 6d. net.

Political Economy. By C. S. Devas, M.A. Oxon. Third Edition (seventeenth thousand). 6s. 6d. net.

Theories of Knowledge : Absolutism, Pragmatism, Realism. By Leslie J. Walker, S.J., M.A. London. Second Edition. 6s. 6d. net.

Principles of Logic. By G. H. Joyce, S.J., M.A. New [Third] Edition. 8s. 6d. net.

Principles of Natural Theology. By G. H. Joyce, S.J., M.A. 8s. 6d. net.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., LTD.,
43 ALBERT DRIVE, LONDON, S.W.19

THE MONTH

VOL. CLXXIX

SEPT.—OCT., 1943

No. 935

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

The Italian Situation

EVEN though it has not produced the results that were hoped for, the capitulation of Italy marks a very definite turning point of the war. Against such a happening the Germans had taken their precautions—precautions that are likely to cost Italy dear. Is it too much to say that they saw it coming? The German press claims, on the whole, that Italy's action came as a shock to the German people. The *Essen National Zeitung*, for example, writes, on September 10th :

Although events in Italy did not surprise the German leaders it cannot be denied that the German public never dreamt of such treachery on the part of the ruling political and military class. The explanation must primarily be sought in the fact that inside Germany there is a tendency to judge events from the German point of view, both mental and moral. The Germans, undoubtedly, thought that Fascism was as firmly rooted in the masses in Italy as is the National-Socialist idea in the German population and that, therefore, the Italian people would not coldly surrender to the British and American enemy.

Probably the Allied leaders would have done better had they moved more speedily and not insisted with the Italians on the formula of "unconditional surrender." The delays of middle and late August permitted the Germans to build up their strength in Northern Italy ; and for the present, most of the armistice terms are in abeyance. There was, of course, evidence of Italian demoralisation. Garrisons in Rhodes and the Dodecanese surrendered to mere handfuls of German troops. To balance this, two Italian divisions expelled the Germans from Sardinia ; and not only in neutral Sweden but also in "allied" Finland the Italian representatives have refused to recognize any authority except that of the King and Marshal Badoglio. We now possess the Italian fleet ; passage through the Mediterranean has been made secure ; and save where the Germans have established themselves, in Crete, Rhodes and some of the Dodecanese islands, we control the Mediterranean and will be able to use the Adriatic. Further, as President Roosevelt noted, the Allied navies will now have the ships to close the gap between North-West Australia and India. Mr. Churchill's long-term Mediterranean strategy has been thoroughly justified. Three summers ago, it required great vision and courage to despatch a portion of our then slender forces and resources to

Egypt and the Near East. That long-sighted strategy is now, fully and finally, crowned with success. The story of the gradual conquest of Italy overseas, with forces far inferior in number to those in possession, will remain an epic one. And the record of the Eighth Army, in its gallant Odyssey since El Alamein, has few, if any, parallels in history. Mr. Churchill's resolution of three years ago, boldly carried through by men like Sir Andrew Cunningham, saved North Africa and the Near and Middle East from German domination. Recent information from Germany suggests that the loss of Tunisia had a more disastrous effect upon German home morale than even the defeat at Stalingrad. The Stalingrad failure had been carefully written up and it was presented with that atmosphere of tragedy, with which the German mind is in strange sympathy. There was no time to "write-up" Tunisia. The news got through too rapidly. Besides, no propaganda agency can stage repeated tragedies with any success. It is also clear that the great German retreat in Russia is due, in increasing measure, to their apprehensions about Southern and South-East Europe. The battle of the Mediterranean is definitely won. That of Europe is beginning, and it is certain to be the hardest, if perhaps not the longest, of the war. The capture of Sicily and the recovery at Salerno from an initially critical position are good auguries.

Neutral Reports

ACCOUNTS published during recent weeks in the neutral press make it evident that there is considerable Italian resistance to the Germans in Northern Italy. Swiss correspondents noted in mid-September that the resuscitation of Mussolini had had little consequence. The German story of enthusiastic crowds giving vent to their Fascist feelings in the Piazza Venezia, they reduced to the item of two or three hundred young Blackshirts, largely amusing themselves. According to the Swedish paper, *Svenska Dagbladet*, leaflets have been scattered throughout Milan, with the message: "We Milanese are prisoners, that is true, but we feel free none the less, since our real enemy has dropped his disguise as our ally." A manifesto, issued by five anti-Fascist parties in Milan, including the "Christian Democratic Movement," contains the following sentences: "The so-called Fascist Government, based on foreign bayonets, accuses the legal Government of treachery and invites our soldiers to desertion and rebellion. . . . Italian patriots have in this hour only one duty: resistance at all costs against the German invaders and Fascists who arrive thirsting for vengeance in the invaders' tanks. . . . The struggle will be severe and hard, but only the achievement of freedom will deliver us from twenty years of shame." The Swiss paper, *Der Bund*, reports days of bitter street-fighting in Rome before the German troops could master the situation, and

gives the impression that the district of Trastevere was not yet occupied and that *franc tireurs* and *saboteurs* were active all over the Roman Campagna. The fact that the Italian civil population and large numbers of Italian soldiers are working with the Allies against the Germans may soon make Italy our effective ally. Late in September it was widely believed that negotiations were being carried on in Palermo to bring about an Italian declaration of war on Germany and the recognition of Italy as an Allied nation.

Hitler's Latest Speech

HITLER'S latest speech, of September 10th, was revealing, not least to the Italian people. From it they learnt that it was the King and conservative Italian elements, especially Marshal Badoglio and senior generals, that had kept Italy out of the war in 1939.

In August, 1939, the very same forces which have to-day brought about the capitulation succeeded in preventing Italy from entering the war. As the Führer of the German nation I had to show understanding for these extraordinary difficulties of the Duce. In June, 1940, Mussolini had succeeded in obtaining the internal prerequisites for Italy's entry into the war at the side of the Reich. But this attitude Mussolini had only been able to assert in Italy with the greatest difficulty, in the face of opposition not from the Italian people but from certain circles.

Hitler's knowledge of the Italian people is obviously limited. Not so his estimate of the strong forces which endeavoured to keep Italy out of the war and presumably only then allowed Italy to be dragged into the war, when they considered it to have been already won and nearly finished. No one will claim that these "certain circles" were not swayed by the Italian national policy of *Sacro Egoismo*, common to Italian Liberals and Socialists before 1922 and to Fascists since that date. But at least it is clear that conservative Italian elements did not want to be brought into a European war on the side of Germany, and that it was Mussolini and his Fascists who were responsible for Italy's share in the war and consequently for the many disasters that have overtaken Italians during the past three years. Hitler has told them the man and the party they have to blame, and it is fairly obvious that they are blaming him and it. Mussolini's chief opponents, in this and in many another matter, were just the conservative and monarchical influences within Italy. "Reactionary enemies of social justice"—that is Hitler's expression for these opponents. The *Essen National Zeitung*, for September 10th, attributed the surrender to "those classes of the Italian people who, since the days of Cavour, gathered not around the people and the fatherland but exclusively around the throne and the clergy and who regarded Fascism as a threat to their social rights." In other words, what was most anti-Nazi and anti-Fascist in Italy was what

was most traditionally Italian. Our own propagandists would do well to study this latest Hitler speech. He attributes the fall of Fascism to those Italian elements to which the ordinary Marxist writer attributes its origin and rise. To the latter, Fascism was a last fling of Italian "reactionary," that is conservative, influences. Hitler, on this subject much better informed, recognizes that those influences were opposed to Fascism all along and were particularly against Italy's entry into the war. Mussolini's emergence as the leader of a new Quisling and republican Fascist party, under German tutelage, will do much to discredit him finally—more in all probability than any summary justice inflicted upon him by the Allies would have done.

Germany's Problem of an Ally

IT is not always realised how Germany's plans of aggression take for granted the existence of another European Power as her ally. We say frequently that the war might have been prevented had the British, French and Polish Governments had the courage to oppose the re-occupation of the Rhineland by German troops. It is less frequently noticed that the war might also have been prevented had Germany failed to secure Italy as an ally. One of the tragedies of history between 1935 and 1939 was the gradual turning of Italy towards Germany and the establishment of the Axis. That establishment made war possible for Germany and certain for Europe. And yet this rapprochement was contrary to the real desires of the Italian people for whom the Germans are the traditional enemy. Parallels can readily be drawn between Austria-Hungary during the war of 1914-1918 and Italy in the present war. In both of these struggles Germany needed and had an ally—an ally which, on both occasions, collapsed. Indeed, a slight study of the documents that immediately preceded the war of 1914-1918 shows that one of Germany's main concerns was to retain her ally, and, to do this, she was ready to support that ally whatever might be the consequences. In the beginning of July, 1914, Germany gave to Austria-Hungary a free hand in the Balkans, after the assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand at Sarajevo. On July 5th, the German Emperor declared to the Austrian Ambassador in Berlin, that, if Austria-Hungary recognized the necessity of warlike action against Serbia, he, the Emperor, would regret it if the Austrian Government did not make use of the present moment, since this was all in Austria's favour. The Kaiser also assured the Ambassador that, should a war between Austria-Hungary and Russia be unavoidable, Austria-Hungary might remain convinced that Germany would stand at her side. The next day, July 6th, the German Chancellor, Bethmann-Hollweg, stated: "As far as concerns Serbia, His Majesty of course cannot interfere in the dispute now going on between Austria-Hungary and

that country, as it is a matter not within his competence. The Emperor Francis Joseph may, however, rest assured that His Majesty will faithfully stand by Austria-Hungary, as is required by the obligations of his alliance and of his ancient friendship." Even then the German mind was haunted by the phantom of encirclement and isolation—an isolation created largely by its own attitude towards other Powers, an isolation which German cruelty and misconduct during this war will have intensified a thousandfold. This was brought out in the evidence given by von Jagow before the Reichstag Committee of Enquiry, constituted in 1919. Jagow then made the following statement :

A permanently weakened and finally crumbling Austria could no longer have remained for us an ally with whom we could reckon and on whom we could depend. Germany's isolation would then have been complete. . . . We fully approved, for the reasons submitted, the spontaneous determination of Vienna to proceed against Serbia.

There was one moment when the Kaiser hesitated before the likely consequences of this uncritical promise of help. "The stupidity and clumsiness of our ally has been made a hangman's noose for us." The mood did not last, however. Germany, entering that war on her ally's side, attacked Russia and France over an international issue that was not it itself as acute as several other issues had been during the previous twenty years, but over which negotiation had successfully tided.

Nevertheless

BUT, although we may shortly find an Italy, under Marshal Badoglio, fighting officially alongside the Allies, it is none the less true that the Italian nation cannot shake off its responsibility for the war and unload that burden exclusively upon Mussolini and the Fascists. We have already noted that, in all probability, Germany would not have embarked upon a European war had she not felt that she had at least one greater European Power as her ally. Besides, there are the attacks upon Abyssinia, Albania and Greece to be accounted for ; and the conduct of the Italian divisions during this war in the Balkans will require examination. It may be true that the Italian people have been more sinned against than sinning : but, where such gigantic issues are in question, even passive acquiescence in evil brings its measure of guilt. They may yet redeem much of that evil by co-operating sincerely with the Allies and clearing their own country of the Germans. The future form of government and political organization in Italy must, of course, be a matter for the Italians themselves. What they require at present is the maximum possible amount of unity and cohesion. This is necessary because

of the terrible conditions in which Italy is placed as the battleground between Germany and the Allies, and also on account of the element of civil war, between the Italian Government and a new Fascist party, which the Nazis are trying to instigate. That is why the official policy of the Allied leaders towards the present Italian Government is sane and sound, and also why some of the remarks made in the House of Commons, after Mr. Churchill's speech, were so ignorant and disturbing. To argue, as did two members, that the Italian people will not follow "turncoats" or that we should not allow ourselves to be associated with what the speaker called "near-Fascists," is, as Mr. Churchill pointed out, to endanger the lives, and increase the difficulties of our own soldiers. One member attributed the fall of Fascism to strikes which he imagined to have developed on a large scale in Milan and Turin. Hitler was truer to actual fact when he attributed it to the conservative factors in Italian life that had all along disliked, and now openly opposed, Fascism. The use of the expression "near-Fascist" is significant. It is a loose term—looser even than the already loose word "Fascist"—that individuals can apply gaily to any systems of which they care to disapprove. Why, might we ask, turning the question, should the British and American peoples, who are admired on the Continent because of their stability and a consistently sound and free way of life, look for support in other countries only among the "Communist" or "near-Communist" elements? Mr. Bowles, the Labour member for Nuneaton, declared in the House that this was really a class-war. This is of course exactly what the Nazis state, only their argument is that they, a truly democratic people, are fighting against the "demo-plutocracies," namely Britain and the United States. You have confusion if you argue by labels and slogans, rather than according to historical and actual realities. The great majority of the Italian people—this is probably true of every people—are non-political; they want to be governed, not in accordance with this or the other ideology, but justly and fairly, so that they can live in decency and relative comfort and at peace with their fellow countrymen and with the peoples of other countries. Finally, one word may well be added about the monarchy in Italy. Critics of the King should notice that the new Fascist party of Mussolini proclaims itself to be republican, showing that it knows perfectly well that the King had a large share in its dismissal. And certain Italian exiles have expressed the opinion that the House of Savoy has compromised it hopelessly with Fascism. Yet, in our own tradition, it is not the custom to attach any blame to the King because of the policy or the ineptitude of his ministers. Critics of Munich in 1938 do not include His Majesty in their condemnation: nor do those who blame the unreadiness of Ramsay MacDonald and Baldwin to face the gravest problems of national defence extend their censure to the throne.

Germany's Smaller Allies

THERE remain, linked in various bonds with Germany : Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Slovakia and Finland. The collapse of Italy has had important effects on the Hungarians. They had already withdrawn their troops from the Russian front, claiming that their only fight against Bolshevism was on the home front. The Prime Minister, Kállay, has declared that Hungary desires peace but can accept only that peace settlement which will leave Hungary's present position unaffected. From time to time there emerge bitter squabbles between Hungarian and Slovakian newspapers, the former accusing Slovakia of being merely a mushroom State, brought into existence through Nazi generosity, the latter denouncing Hungarian claims to all the territories of St. Stephen's Crown. Rumania is war-weary after her immense casualties on the Eastern front. In Bulgaria the mystery of King Boris's death is unexplained. The people are Slav and pro-Russian, the newly-chosen Government is less favourable to the Germans. Of all these countries that have, in different degree, associated themselves with the German plan for European aggression, Finland deserves our greatest sympathy. They were attacked by Russia in 1939, and it was against Russia that they had fought in 1918 and 1919. Ultimately, peace was arranged between Finland and Soviet Russia in 1940 ; but there was the uneasy feeling that Germany, then using its non-aggression pact with Russia, had forced the Finns to this procedure. Secretly, no doubt, the Finns were promised their revenge and the recovery of the places they had to abandon to Russia. The fall of Italy was felt too in Finland. The Finnish press commented on the event with full frankness. In mid-September *Helsingin Samosat* wrote : " We must find for ourselves the way out to calmer waters. In this sense the dramatic events in Southern Europe are a stimulus to our own political thinking." *Suomen Sosialidemokraatti* declared that the path of Italy through a certain national humiliation would lead Italy back to democracy and peaceful international co-operation. This paper concluded with the statement that Italy had an important mission to fulfil which could be undertaken by no other nation. Another Finnish organ, *Hufvudstadsbladet*, commenting upon an article in an Hungarian journal on the position of smaller countries, argued : " We do not know what peace terms the Allies have thought of giving us. But in different connections it has been intimated to us that it will be a special concession if our defensive struggle is to be rewarded with the right for us to continue as a free people." One Swedish paper recently declared that the whole Finnish people, including Government and army, would welcome peace to-morrow if only they could feel reasonably secure about their frontiers. A fuller Swedish report, in *Dagens Nyheter* for September 9th and 10th, is more cautious. It suggests that the higher army officers retain

confidence in the army's strength and morale and in the excellently fortified positions which they occupy. They would not welcome any hasty peace overtures that might be misconstrued as evidence of Finnish weakness. It records a widespread Finnish feeling that any definite approach to Moscow for peace terms might be interpreted as a wish to get out of the war at any cost and would result in the proposal of stiffer conditions, that would be unacceptable to the Finns. On the whole, the report judges, the Finnish people have been living in such a continual state of tension during the past four years that they are somewhat fatalistic and think that somehow and someday they will emerge with relatively easy peace terms from their present plight. One major difficulty for the Finns is the presence of German troops in Northern Finland.

The Fulda Pastoral Letter

IN mid-September, the Vatican Radio broadcast the full text of the German bishops' letter issued this year from Fulda. The letter was signed by three Cardinals—Cardinal Bertram of Breslau, Cardinal Faulhaber of Munich, and Cardinal Innitzer of Vienna—by 26 German Archbishops and Bishops who were also present and by six other delegates vested with plenary powers by their dioceses. Cardinal Bertram was present at the meeting but, owing to ill-health and advanced age, was unable to preside: his place as Chairman was taken by Cardinal Faulhaber. The reading of the pastoral letter from Catholic pulpits was ordered, in most German dioceses, for Sunday, August 29th. The letter was of the greatest importance. In the first place, it asserted the bishops' solidarity with the German soldier fighting in the field and with the German civilian working and suffering at home: should the front break, there would be inestimable disaster. It deplored the consequences of air-raids for "innocent non-combatants," for children, the aged and the infirm, and to its paragraph on the air war, it added: "In time of war conscience and responsibility before God and history still exist for the powers of the State. Injustice remains injustice, even in time of war." But by far the larger portion of the pastoral letter was concerned with conditions in Germany and with the problem of preserving German Catholics from dangers that threaten them at home. The letter begins with an emphatic assertion that Christianity has been of the highest value in German history. It denies very forcibly the Nazi allegation that Christian faith and teaching are alien to the true German character or have had adverse effects upon genuine German development. "Only ignorance or insincerity," the bishops claim, "can dare to assert that the introduction of Christianity was a misfortune for Germany." Yet, this is what Herr Rosenberg and his associates have been asserting for the past ten years:

All the intellectual movements (the letter continues), all the purely

temporal ideologies which moved away from the Christian faith have revealed themselves as paths of error and have ended in bitter disappointments. In the end, every time, there was the warning: Return to the Lord your God; return to Christ, for He alone is the Light of the world, He alone is the Way, the Truth and the Life. Only the Christian faith and God's commandments are the bedrock on which truth, right and justice, peace and freedom, authority and discipline, any righteous and happy life and any ordered form of community life must be based and established.

The pastoral summons German Catholics to sincere and constant prayer. "Prayer, frequent prayer, prayer from the depth of faith, is needed more than ever in times that are as hard as ours. Then the bond that links us with God must be knit and strengthened every day. Individual prayer, family prayer and public communal prayer must therefore be considered sacred duties and regarded with the highest respect." In the second portion of the letter certain specific problems are mentioned. Germans are asked to show Christian charity to evacuees and the evacuees are reminded of their duty of gratitude. Catholic parents are warned that they must make provision for the religious education of their children:

As parents and guardians, you have the right to demand that even in camps your children have facilities to go to Holy Mass on Sundays and to receive religious instruction in the doctrines of our Holy Faith. Fight for this right, and do not desist until it has been granted to you. We, German bishops, do all that is in our power that our priests may stand by your side everywhere, even in the Diaspora, and give you the opportunity to receive the Holy Sacraments and religious instruction. May this gigantic internal migration which has seized our whole people, and which confronts us with unheard-of tasks for the care of the soul, in the end strengthen our faith and promote Christian life.

The bishops next appeal for unity, for that spirit of unity that is called for by common danger and common suffering. Here the pastoral turns bluntly on the Nazis. "We would be well pleased," write the bishops:

If in the present dangerous and difficult situation of our Fatherland, everything that endangers and prevents the unity and the peace of the people should be avoided. But unfortunately we must state with profound regret that the fight against the Christian faith and against the Church of Christ is still being waged, that school and instruction are still used to de-Christianize the people, and especially the youth, that evacuees in camps, boarding schools and hostels are refused religious instruction, that it is often made impossible for children to go to Church and receive the Sacraments, and that on many Christians severe moral pressure is still being exercised which in the Warthegau (the part of Poland which has been temporarily incorporated in Germany), amounts to *an almost complete suppression of the exercise of the Christian religion*. We must regret that even to-day the holding of Christian services is made difficult or even prevented,

that after a night air raid alarm religious services have been made subject to an emergency law, and that on Christian Holy Days even the purely religious services in churches are penalised by burdensome restrictions. How sad it is that these and other violations of the Christian religion hinder the internal peace and unity of the German people in this difficult time !

The pastoral concludes with an eloquent prayer to St. Boniface, which asks that German Catholics may acquire " a holy Christian intransigence and may die rather than deny the heritage of our fathers, the Holy Catholic Faith."

The Moscow Patriarchate

ON September 8th, the Metropolitan Sergius of Moscow, who since 1925 has been *locum tenens* of the Patriarchate of the Russian Orthodox Church, was elected Patriarch by an Episcopal assembly in Moscow. Four days later, he was formally installed in the cathedral at Moscow. This Russian Patriarchate was first instituted in 1589, several decades after the fall of Constantinople to the Turks had shifted the political emphasis within the Orthodox churches and when Moscow was being hailed by Russian Christians as the " Third Rome," the one authentic Christian Church. In 1721, Peter the Great suppressed the office, replacing it by a Holy Synod, modelled on the Lutheran system of Prussia and Sweden. The bishops composing the Synod were dependent upon a State-appointed Procurator General so that the transition from Patriarch to Synod meant a closer and growing control of the Church by the Moscow Government. With the disappearance of the monarchy, the Holy Synod went too ; and in 1917 a national council restored the office of Patriarch, electing the Metropolitan Tikhon. Tikhon died in 1925, but, until three or four weeks back, no successor was allowed to be appointed. Through the years of violent anti-Christian persecution there was no formal Patriarch. What are the motives behind this new change of policy ? Does it indicate a new religious attitude on the part of the Soviet authorities ? We must beware of extreme views. It would be unfair to the Orthodox bishops and clergy, many of whom have lived with courage and heroism through periods of defamation and persecution, to suggest that they are deceiving their own people and the world, and are lending Christian support to a national effort, with nothing more to it than that. Yet, the Soviet Union remains an officially atheist State ; and all the modifications of the new 1936 constitution have not altered its fundamental character. Certain factors, however, appear to be asserting themselves. The first is the undoubted growth of Russian national feeling during the war. It was the Church that held Russia together during the centuries of the Tartar occupation, and true Russian culture is deeply tinged with Orthodox Christianity. The more strongly this national

character is emphasized, so much the greater is the real need for the Russian Church as part of it. Besides, this growth of Russian feeling involves also a development of the Slav and Pan-Slav sentiment. The Pan-Slav movement has always had a religious as well as a racial background ; and its importance for Serbia and Bulgaria should not be underrated. In the second place, it is clear that a large number of officers, technicians and scientists in Russia have, for a long time, have had no interest in, and have been opposed to, the current Leninist philosophy. There are certainly strong *Russian* as well as *Bolshevik* influences in the highest Moscow councils and one party that is determined to secure as strong a position as possible for Russian influence after the war. In so far as the appointment of a Patriarch means a moderation, at least in practice, of the official anti-Christian policy and makes it easier for Russian Christians to practise their religion, it is a step naturally to be welcomed. There are, however, some disquieting features. As far as Catholics are concerned, there is not yet religious toleration in the Soviet Union.

Available information shows that priests are still imprisoned, that the condition of Polish civilians on Russian soil is most unfortunate. There may be ground for further apprehension in the fact that, together with the Patriarchate, was revived the Synod, to consist of the Patriarch and six Metropolitans ; for the Synod stood for the subordination of the Orthodox Church to the State. Such a subordination must, of course, be expected in Soviet Russia, a completely organized totalitarian State. It emerges, strikingly and not a little pathetically, from the appeal issued on September 17th by the Russian bishops and addressed to all Christians in Allied countries. This appeal contained the expressed hope that by the efforts of such Christians "*the long-expected second front* will at last be established and will bring nearer victory and peace at this favourable moment when our own Red Army is victoriously pushing the enemy from our lands." In other words, the first Christian message of the newly-recognised Russian hierarchy includes a political appeal, dictated by the Soviet authorities, over the heads of Allied Governments to their peoples.

This Second Front Business

WE have the greatest admiration for the qualities shown by the Russian armies in the field and by the Russian population behind the lines. Both have suffered extremely ; both have reacted with gallantry and heroism. Further, it is evident that there will be small hope of the post-war world enjoying the benefits of security and peace unless the Russian people can be integrated into a genuine association of nations. Much has depended upon Russia during the past two years of war ; even more may depend upon Russia when the war is won. One serious obstacle to the establishment of more

cordial relations between Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union is the unwarrantable manner in which the Soviet authorities endeavour to influence British and American policy through political appeals to sections of the British and American peoples. We can understand the great desire the Russians have of a *second front* in Western Europe, that will draw from the German Eastern front something like sixty German divisions. What is less understandable is the general lack of public appreciation, shown in Russia, of the material assistance received from Britain and the U.S.A., and the failure to understand the immense gain to Russia of the Allied control of the Atlantic and Mediterranean and of the defeat of one of the three Axis partners. What is even less understandable is the Russian attempt to bring pressure to bear upon British and American policy and public opinion through underhand, or at least unofficial, channels. An invasion of Western Europe, dictated by political rather than military considerations, would have been disastrous, not only to Britain and America, but disastrous also to the Russian armies. Mr. Churchill's Mediterranean strategy, we have already remarked, has thoroughly justified itself. The recent Trades Union Congress once again repudiated the attempt of the delegates from Russia to urge this point. Sir Walter Citrine put it firmly, when he declared :

It is just as well to have it firmly understood that in international affairs we are not likely to be diverted from what we believe to be right by abuse or misrepresentation, no matter from what quarter it may come, whether at home or abroad.

Referring to his own visit to the Soviet Union, Sir Walter declared:

It seemed to me that on that occasion there was a complete underestimate by the Russians of the significance of what was happening in Italy and the totality of the Allied war effort.

It would, of course, be easy to retort to Russian critics that we find it hard to understand the excellent relations they manage to maintain with Japan. Soviet Russia, from its own national point of view, is perfectly right in maintaining those relations. They render possible the transit of vast cargoes from the U.S.A. to the Soviet Union. If the British people were to subsidise a campaign within Russia for the opening of a "second front" in Siberia or Manchuria, we should not be astonished if the Soviet Government thoroughly disapproved. We disapprove equally of their clumsy efforts—whether this be through Russian ecclesiastics or Trade Unionists—to interfere in our strategic decisions. But, in this matter, there is another point. Russia could well serve the cause of the United Nations by exercising a more effective control of Chinese Communists. The struggle of China against Japan has caught the imagination of all free peoples. But, in September, 1943, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-Shek made this speech :

If you share my view, we should maintain our policy of leniency and forbearance which we have consistently pursued in dealing with domestic affairs, with the hope that the Communist Party in China will be moved by our sincerity, no matter in what ways they may slander us or in what manner they try to create trouble. . . . We should make it clear that the Central Government has no particular demand to make of the Chinese Communist Party, but it hopes it will abandon its policy of forcibly occupying national territory and will abandon its tactics of attacking National Chinese troops on various sectors, thus obstructing the prosecution of the war against Japan. . . . If the Communist Party can prove its good faith by making good its promises, the Central Government, taking notice of its sincerity and loyalty in the common resistance, will once more treat it with sympathy and consideration, so that together we may accomplish hand in hand the great task of resistance to the common enemy and reconstruction.

It does not appear out of place to ask from the Soviet Government, if not active warfare against Japan, at least instructions to Chinese Communists not to make the heroic defence of Chiang Kai-Shek more difficult than circumstances and the Japanese enemy have made it.

China and the Catholic Church

ACCOUNTS of speeches in the United States by the Chinese Catholic Bishop Yu-Pin and some articles by His Excellency have recently reached us. In them he addresses himself particularly to American Catholics. When the Jesuit Vicar Apostolic of Shanghai installed him, in 1936, as Vicar Apostolic of Nanking, the experienced Jesuit missionary declared :

The Jesuit Fathers deliver into your hands this Mission, founded by Father Ricci himself, even as in ancient days Olympic runners handed on their torch to those that came after them. Until now, it is we who have run with this torch of Catholic Faith ; it is now for you to take it and carry it forward.

Bishop Yu-Pin eulogizes Father Ricci's methods. "To the Chinese Ricci became a Chinese that he might gain the Chinese for Christ." Ricci understood that China was not a barbarian country ; he spent nine years in the study of its language and literature. "Provisionally, too, he associated with real Chinese scholars and thinkers like Li Chih-tsao, Hsu Kuang-ch'i and Yang T'ing-yuan, rather than with the professional scholars who have given a caricature of Chinese scholarship."

Thus equipped, Ricci and his band of missionaries set about translating into Chinese the important contemporary works of Western scientific and philosophical literature. By 1636, they had published no fewer than 340 treatises on religion, physics, astronomy and mathematics. The translation of Euclid into Chinese is attributed to Ricci's convert, Paul Hsu.

Thus, thanks to their respect for Chinese culture and to their introduction into China of scientific knowledge from the West, these early

missionaries achieved notable success. By the end of the reign of the last effective Ming Emperor, Ch'ung Cheng, in 1644, their converts numbered 114 members of the Imperial family and fourteen high officials. Among the latter was the Prime Minister, Paul Hsu Kuang-ch'i, as well as the two scholars preciously mentioned (Li Chih-tsao and Yang T'ing-yuan).

Then came the great break between China and Western Christianity. Bishop Yu-Pin continues this argument, in an article in *America*. The prospects for Christianity to-day in China are extraordinary. The new President of the whole country, Chiang Kai-Shek, is a sincere Christian, as is a very considerable portion of the Chinese National Council. Bishop Yu-Pin is himself a member of that supreme national body. But he warns us: "If we wish to see Catholic influence preponderant in China, we must set to work to form among Chinese Catholics an intellectual élite." To-day, he informs us, the number of Catholic institutions of higher learning in China is relatively small, and the four million Chinese Catholics "exert little influence on the Chinese public in comparison with their numbers. Protestant Christians, though fewer in number, are more influential, thanks to the large number of their institutions of higher education." This is not exactly cheerful reading. Bishop Yu-Pin goes on to argue that Catholic missionaries must have respect for Chinese culture and must also be able to satisfy the intellectual requirements of the Chinese people. He obviously looks to the Church in the United States to supply these missionaries, but emphasizes certain dangers:

After the war, there will be a cultural Renaissance in China. It is of the utmost importance that this resurgent movement should be influenced by Catholic leadership. But unless the future missionaries to China, as well as the native and foreign clergy now in China, begin at once to prepare themselves for a great intellectual apostolate, it is quite certain that not Catholics but the enemies of Catholic truth will be the architects of the New Order destined to arise in China after the war. May God raise up among the Catholic students of the United States new Xaviers and new Riccis for the great enterprise of building New China on the *One Foundation* which is Christ.

So far the Chinese Catholic Bishop Yu-Pin—a remarkable person who is mentioned in an article also in this number. A report from the *Osservatore Romano* gives a number of rules of general asceticism that Generalissimo Chiang Kai-Shek has laid down for his sorely-tried people. They run as follows:—

- (i) All citizens must, during the war, lead an austere life.
- (ii) They must form the habit of doing everything carefully and conscientiously.
- (iii) They must develop the spirit of sacrifice, for only in this way can the defence of the country be strengthened.
- (iv) They must develop the spirit of loyalty towards their country.
- (v) They must put firm faith in the Revolution and in the work of reconstruction.

"East is East, and West is West"—that we know; but it appears that the West can learn many lessons from the East. An American Catholic weekly, commenting upon these recommendations, writes as follows:

The Generalissimo knows that an unspiritual people cannot do a spiritual work. He is not calling for just a raising of morale or an intensifying of the war effort. His words go deeper than that. Almost alone among the statesmen of the free world has he seen and proclaimed the necessity of a moral regeneration of the person, leading to a moral regeneration of society, as a prerequisite to victory and to a just use of victory.

Balkan Chaos

ONE example of the chaos into which Italy's capitulation has further thrown the Balkans may be taken from Yugoslavia, in particular from Croatia and the Dalmatian coast. There was confusion enough before; now it is worse confounded. No sooner was the armistice made known than German and Croat troops started to occupy towns and centres previously held by the Italians. Italian garrisons were disarmed but it was known that Italian soldiers had been handing over their arms and ammunition to the patriot partisan forces. Pavelić who under Nazi protection acts as Governor of an "independent" Croatia, at once annulled the military pacts between this Croatia and Italy and also the Treaty of Rome, concluded in 1941, which ceded to Italy certain districts along the Adriatic coastline and offered the Croatian crown to the Italian Duke of Spoleto—an honour which the Duke appeared in no hurry to enjoy. "As the King of Croatia, designated on May 18th, 1941, has up to the present day made no use whatever of his designation, I declare the offer and the designation are null and void for the Independent State of Croatia"—so ran a proclamation of Pavelić of September 11th. In point of fact, the King of Italy had already put an end to this situation after the fall of Mussolini. So ended what might have been a Ruritanian adventure, had the chief character concerned been in greater earnest. Meanwhile, Balkan partisans have become more active. They held for a time the city of Split and have cut the important railway lines between Zagreb and Belgrade and between Zagreb and Budapest. The Pavelić Government admits that many Italian soldiers have joined the partisans but adds that General Amico, Italian commander in Southern Dalmatia, who had got into touch with the Serbian General Mihailovich, was murdered by some of his own troops. Incidentally, the Nazi resuscitation of Mussolini as head of a neo-Fascist party has added to the problems of this Croatian puppet-government. As soon as the armistice was declared, these Croatians not only marched with the Germans to seize territory that was previously in Italian hands; they also closed all Italian centres and institutes in Dalmatia and took away their passports

from Italian civilians. The Anglo-American invasion of Italy has given fresh hopes to the opposition parties in Croatia for the majority of the Croats have no genuine sympathy with the German-imposed Pavelić regime. The most influential person in the country is Dr. Matchek, head of the Peasant Party, who has steadily refused all co-operation with the Germans and with Pavelić's followers and for the past 28 months has remained in a strict political isolation. Matchek is anti-Nazi and anti-German, of course, and a large proportion of his supporters are Anglophile. It is probably true to say that the majority of the Croats would now prefer federal union or close association with the Serbs and Slovenes after the war to a highly doubtful independence. But they want real guarantees that they will not, as a people, be made responsible for the behaviour and the outrages of Pavelić and his Ustashis and that they will not be made subject to any Pan-Serb policy, signs of which they affect to see in the pronouncements of the Yugoslav Government in London and among the Serbs in the United States. They also desire that the Serbian General Mihailovich should confine his military operations to Serbian territory. The political tension in Croatia between Pavelić and the parties opposed to him, between Serb and Croat as well, is also intensified by a certain religious tension, that has been exploited by the Germans—namely between Catholics and Orthodox. Finally, among the partisans active in Croatia there are peasant bands that are not specially political in outlook but merely opposed to the occupying Germans and the Quisling Croats; there are other bands, in sympathy with Communism. The latter accuse General Mihailovich of remaining on the defensive and leaving the active resistance to the partisans. The Soviet Union, while aiding and encouraging the Balkan partisans, does not like General Mihailovich or the Yugoslav Government in London. The Russians, with their sharply reviving Slav consciousness, are highly interested in Balkan developments. Indeed, it is likely that they do not view an Anglo-American invasion of and through the Balkans with any marked sympathy. This may be a further reason why they press with such insistence for a second front in the West, and nowhere else. Incidentally, throughout this paragraph, the word "partisan" has been used to include all those patriot forces in the Balkans that are actively fighting the Germans. Many of our reports of this patriot activity come from a radio station, calling itself "Free Yugoslavia," that functions outside of Yugoslavia and is not connected with the Yugoslav Government. The result is that reports are confused, and sometimes too great prominence is given to the local "partisan" bodies, some of which are definitely Communist. The Germans face serious problems in the Balkans. Hungary will not help and, up to date, has not recognized the neo-Fascist Government of Mussolini. Perhaps, the Germans are beginning to remember that their break-up in 1918 began in those same Balkans.

THE SOUL OF NONCONFORMITY

SOME might doubt whether Nonconformity had a soul ; for, viewed from the outside, all that some could discern would seem a somewhat disorderly and entirely unattractive body. The truth is, however, that Nonconformity is almost nothing but a soul searching for a suitable body ; is not quite clear where its soul is, and therefore it is always in danger of being lost. Historically, of course, the word Nonconformity indicates a refusal to accept the Act of Uniformity, and on that issue Catholics in England must also be reckoned Nonconformists ; so we can start on some common ground, however slight. The historical development of Nonconformity tells us however more than does the exact occasion of its origin ; for it has proved itself to be a movement which progressively seeks emancipation from all external forms, and, particularly, in respect of Orders, Liturgy and Creeds. It is unnecessary to review in detail the actual stage of repudiation that the various constitutive denominations have reached and stopped at. It might be maintained that the logical stopping place is Quakerism, or perhaps something still further out ; what is known as "blue-domism." Anyhow, the logical conclusion has not yet been drawn by everyone, and it is not unfair to say that Nonconformity as a whole has settled down to the position that, whatever forms may be retained, none of them are essential, and therefore those can be adopted which the times or taste demand. Hence the modern preference for the title of the "Free Churches" ; both terms being left somewhat vague and undefined. Therefore what any denomination has retained or adopted does not prevent a loose "Federation of the Free Churches," and one could certainly wander round the main denominations at worship without being made aware, apart from curious enquiry, what particular denomination it was.

Nevertheless Nonconformity has been compelled to learn that there are limits to the freedom that can be allowed. The *terminus a quo* is readily discoverable ; and that is most marked in the realm of Orders. Whatever form of ministry is retained, and however it is conceived as authorised, it is allowed no sacerdotal function. In the realm of worship the Lord's Supper is retained, but it is interpreted symbolically, observed with comparative infrequency, and relegated to a mere addendum to the ordinary services ; it is certainly nowhere the real centre of devotion. This is not surprising, because, with the repudiation of the "Real" Presence, whatever benefits are supposed to be obtained can be obtained more directly apart from any such observance. The form of worship now common

to all is therefore much the same, and consists of a sequence of Hymns, Scripture Readings and Prayers, which, if they have any discernible order or purpose, are to lead up to the Sermon, the chief event. It is the preaching that matters, and it is the preaching that alone still draws any crowd. It has been maintained by a distinguished Nonconformist that the Sermon is their uplifting of Christ, and that this is comparable to the elevation of the Host in Catholic worship : or rather, that it might and should be. This confessedly demands preaching of a rare quality and appeal ; and of course there is really nothing in a Sermon that corresponds to what the Mass enshrines, which is the Word made Flesh, still present in His very flesh and blood. A hostile critic might contend that the crowds that flock to the Catholic Mass can be accounted for largely by the obligation of attendance enforced under pain of mortal sin. Nevertheless there is no kind of obligation to Nonconformist worship ; it must depend upon its attractiveness ; and if that is not present there is nothing that can save it. Endeavours are however being made to win back the crowd, but these look in opposite directions. The one is towards adoption of scraps of Liturgy borrowed from the Book of Common Prayer, or, less frequently, by the compilation of entirely new liturgies, either framed on ancient models and collected from ancient sources, or completely modern in language and outlook ; neither likely to become popular. The more common endeavour is to make the service more popular and hearty. This is more often tried, and in the main succeeds, only among Methodists ; and that tells its own story ; for however much that method is still on trial among them, and however much this form may be disliked by some, it is here that the soul of Nonconformity is discovered. For the preaching at such places must be what is called evangelistic ; and the hymns will tell the same story. It needs some discrimination and sympathy to determine what is meant by " evangelistic." It means, of course, as the word indicates, that the preaching is a proclamation of the Gospel ; and that not so much the teaching of the Gospels, but of a fact believed to be derived from them, namely, the presentation of Christ as the Saviour, willing to receive all who turn to Him for salvation. Christ is therefore conceived as spiritually present, and with the same accessibility and power to save as depicted in the Gospels ; but everything brought to a single and simple point which may be decided on and the results experienced there and then. The Hymns only enforce this in more or less poetic, but undoubtedly popular and vivid ways ; and from the way in which they are sung, it is obvious that they profess a definite belief and witness to a definite experience, all centred on Christ the Saviour. Few could fail to be impressed by a great congregation, say in one of the Northern Nonconformist centres, singing " All Hail the Power of Jesu's Name " to the tune " Diadem " or, say, at a Welsh gathering

with the congregation singing "Jesu Lover of my Soul" to the tune, "Aberystwyth." This it would be easy to dismiss as mere emotionalism and to question whether its effects might not be superficial and evanescent; and these suspicions could easily be confirmed. The emotions stirred by the singing of such hymns will certainly not mean the same for everyone, for the tunes are infectious; but similar suspicions might be aroused and could be supported about the crowds attending Mass, or about a Cathedral congregation reciting the Creed; and yet in each case something real and effective would be overlooked.

We have not however indicated where the *terminus ad quem* of Nonconformity is to be looked for. This is to be sought rather upon another line of attempted freedom, namely in the realm of belief. The retention here and there of some credal confession has not hindered, the common retention of Scripture Lessons has not prevented, and the repudiation of all creeds on principle by some has helped towards the infiltration of what Catholics would designate as "Modernism." It must be remembered, however, that this word, pronounced by Catholics with horror, can have quite different associations for Nonconformists. Yet in the general recession from formulated creeds and confessions there has more than once yawned at the bottom of an evidently slippery slope the cold abyss of Unitarianism; and at that word the soul of Nonconformity still shudders, for it has had some experience of its effects, and it knows it means the death of devotion and the end of preaching. It may well be that many Nonconformists, professors, ministers and laity, could be suspected of Unitarianism; they certainly could not pass the verbal tests of formulated Catholic Christology; but when searching for the soul of Nonconformity, too much insistence on verbal tests cannot be enforced, since to them it is the spirit, not the letter that matters; and there again the Hymns sung have to be taken into account and they at least often imply a positive and definite orthodoxy.

Now we are here in sight of the soul of Nonconformity; for if it can be regarded as negatively a brushing away of forms, it is positively the adoption of others, in order to make direct and saving contact between the soul and Christ. To decide that such a thing is impossible, would indict a good deal of Catholic Mystical Doctrine, as well as the purpose of much Catholic practice; namely the making of a "spiritual communion." The present writer has elsewhere openly acknowledged his religious indebtedness to Nonconformity, especially as he knew it in his youth, but some repetition of his reminiscences is the simplest way of indicating why this is conceived as the soul of Nonconformity. The form he was most closely acquainted with might be described as a cultured Evangelicalism. If it was sometimes tinged by a narrow Puritanism, this was due to the conviction that an evangelical experience was enough

to satisfy the soul, not only with religion, but as its recreation ; for it conveyed an inspiration that needed no artificial stimulant or hectic pleasures. Religion was the subject of inexhaustible conversation between friends ; the beauties of nature and the cream of human art only illustrated it ; and it was the source of untarnishable joy. Communion with Christ was sought and was believed to be found in Scripture reading and prayer, private as well as public. The preaching that was thus inspired and supported could arrest the careless, convince the unbeliever, and convert the sinner ; and there can be no doubt that this happened with a frequency, often in the case of stubborn resistance, and with such striking changes in habits and character, as evidenced that a source of divinely saving power had been reached. As the writer knew it, there was little insistence on faith only : the faith that did not issue in works was clearly not saving faith. Extravagancies and aberrations were checked by reverent yet critical use of the Scriptures ; for this enabled one to discriminate between the Old and New Covenants, and between what was temporary and accidental or what was essential and eternal, in either. It is true many things were passed over in reading the Scriptures which Catholics make much of, but these seemed comparatively rare, and were thought to be capable of a spiritual interpretation which Catholicism had materialised ; though beyond that little was heard of anti-Catholic controversy. It was Evangelicals rather than Protestants that we called ourselves, and that made a uniting cross-distinction of all denominations ; for it would be gladly recognised that there were souls in Catholicism equally in real and saving communion with Christ. In St. Augustine's Confessions ; in the reflections of Brother Lawrence ; in the visions of Dante and in the maxims of *The Imitation of Christ*, as well as in the hymns of St. Bernard or Faber, there were notes which struck chords of response, even if others wakened so little that they were not even heard. This must suffice for an appraisal not only of the reality of evangelical experience, but of something which could be claimed as common both to the heart of Catholicism and to the soul of Nonconformity ; and it is submitted that there is ground here for mutual understanding and individual fellowship with the prospect that one day, however still far off, there might be found common ground for a still closer approach.

But if this is to be furthered and hastened, it must first be recognised that Nonconformity has altered and is still altering. Nonconformity started off doctrinally orthodox, at least on such a fundamental subject as Christology. It was saved from the actual invasion and threatened conquest of Arianism by the Evangelical Revival. That revival, stressing the accessibility and saving power of Christ, rested consciously or unconsciously, on His indubitable and full divinity. For no one could be presented as capable of saving the human soul,

anywhere, in any condition, and of every type, save one who was omnipresent, omnipotent and omniscient; and these are the attributes of Absolute Deity alone. The slightest questioning of that and the nerve of Evangelistic preaching is cut and the core of evangelical experience crumbles. The Evangelical Movement has, however, grown weaker in its appeal and effectiveness despite successive revivals. It has always had to face opposition and criticism of various kinds, and more recently changes in personal culture and social habits. All this it might have survived or managed to adapt itself to; indeed, a cultured Evangelism, alive to social obligations, was being slowly worked out. Although ecclesiastically defined doctrine was never an immediate concern of Evangelicalism, much was really taken over from the historic Church, even if here and there it inherited a twist from Lutheran or Calvinist influences, which however was often corrected or re-balanced. But with the rise of advanced Biblical criticism doctrinal disintegration again set in. Although the main interest of Evangelicalism was soteriological rather than Christological, the slightest doubt about Christ's Divinity inevitably affected belief in His saviourhood. So wherever this advanced criticism was admitted devotional fervour and evangelistic zeal began to decline. There has, however, always been resistance to this; and this not so much from "fundamentalist" opposition, which flourishes mostly outside official Nonconformity, as perhaps by the conscious clinging at all costs to Christ's saviourhood, as well as that maintained more indirectly by the retention of the popular hymns and the reading of Scripture in public worship. Moreover the presentations of Christ by particular preachers, or the Christological reconstructions attempted by professors, however regarded as heretical according to defined Catholic doctrine, had been motivated more by the supposed need of emphasizing His humanity than of denying His divinity. For it must be continually remembered that in Nonconformity the Hymn Book does duty for Creed as well as Liturgy; and the old hymns have never been widely abandoned, while, if the Higher Criticism has been given a degree of welcome that our Biblical Commission would certainly not sanction, it was widely regarded as having resolved many of the difficulties created by Scriptural literalism, and, anyhow, these Scriptures continued to be read and studied as if they were of solemn and normative importance. Nevertheless things could not be allowed any longer to remain in this dangerous uncertainty, and just as they seem to have reached a critical stage, a doctrinal revival has begun to make itself felt.

The doctrinal revival observable in Nonconformity has come from a most unexpected quarter and has elected to sail under a strange flag. Although sometimes called Barthianism, from its chief exponent, it can be and is often described as Neo-Calvinism. It is astonishing

that a theology so openly in reaction against the prevailing humanistic influences should have attracted Nonconformists, and it is still more amazing that any kind of Calvinism should have ever dared again to bid for acceptance. It might be suspected that behind it there was the desire to find a bulwark against Catholicism, and that Neo-Calvinism is really a counter-cry against Neo-Thomism. But it has received a less suspicious diagnosis from competent Catholic theologians as a welcome reaction against the immanentism and subjectivism that had become so popular. Anyhow the elements which are emphasised are : first, the absolute transcendency and Sovereignty of God ; secondly, that there is only a kind of one-way approach between God and man ; namely from Him to us ; and, thirdly, man is conceived as being entirely beyond self help because of his utter corruption by sin. This Barthian "crisis" theology has not captured everyone. It is obscure in expression, and narrow in concern ; while its pessimistic estimate of man looks almost as if man were beyond redemption altogether. If this reaction is a helpful symptom, seeing what it has reacted from, it has certainly reacted too far. When this is realised, as it soon must be, it is possible that there will then be an attempt to discover a more balanced view and a wider framework. There is really only one thing left to turn to, and that is Catholic Theology. It is therefore encouraging to find that some Nonconformist professors and preachers are making themselves acquainted with St. Thomas Aquinas, probably greatly helped successively by the later writings of Baron von Hügel, and still more recently and assuredly by the expositions of Maritain, Gilson and Watkin.

Here then is a tendency we might encourage and a promise of return, if we could only make the path plainer and simpler ; especially, in the writer's judgment, if it could be made clear that it is Catholic Theology which alone makes evangelical experience explicable and Catholic devotion that best fosters and safeguards it. Other hopeful developments such as the search for a more orderly and reverent worship, the dissatisfaction with denominationalism, and the association of Nonconformity with the "Ecumenical Movement" have not the critical significance and value of the doctrinal crisis and the discovery of the true way out of it. At present this is not realised by Nonconformists nor are Catholics persuaded that they can lend a hand. For Catholic theologians have first to be persuaded that the evangelical experience is an integral element in Catholicism also ; and then they have to persuade Evangelicals that Catholic Theology specifically defends what is so precious to them, that Catholic devotion creates and fosters that very experience, and that the Catholic Church is therefore the place where the soul of Nonconformity will alone be finally satisfied and preserved. The present writer can claim little competence or skill for such a task

and can only dare to suggest outlines that others will have to fill out, or indicate a path that other builders will have to construct. He nevertheless remains convinced, that, if he understands it at all, the evangelical experience is a veritable effect of the direct action of the Spirit of Christ upon the soul. This seems supported by Christ's own declaration that He has "other sheep" already His, though not yet of "this fold"; that He not only already regards them as His, but He has graciously called them and visited them with His salvation, even if they have yet to be guided to the one flock. The evangelical experience, in the writer's interpretation, is an isolated but critical point of the Gospel of Christ, a kind of telescoped mystical experience. Nevertheless, he is equally convinced that if it is to proceed to the deepest union with God, as well as be handed on to others, it must seek shelter and fulfilment within the Body of the Church. Indeed, the experiences which are claimed by writers like Middleton Murry or Aldous Huxley, might equally be regarded as visitations of the Spirit who inspires where he will; while it remains still more likely that unless this be identified with the Spirit who proceeds from the Father and the Son, and unless they also seek the One Body, they will neither know whence He comes nor whither He goes. For surely all will agree that if we all heard the Spirit accurately, or obeyed Him perfectly, we should be of one accord and be in one place.

It needs considerable knowledge and skill to expound Chalcedonian Christology fully and safely, but there are indubitable points in it which could be expounded so that they persuaded our "separated brethren," and those very far separated, that it was anything but "bankrupt," as a highly placed Anglican once declared it to be. It is, however, obvious that the attempts to find some better explanation have only ended in going behind it and reviving earlier and impossible heresies. The critical point of the Chalcedonian Christology, to which many have taken objection, is that it maintains that the humanity of Christ had no proper person of its own. But this does not mean that the humanity of Christ was unreal or incomplete, still less that it was devoid of personality, as that term is employed to-day, but that its only supporting person was the Person of the Word. Now, if the Person of Christ did not come from "the bosom of the Father," then He can tell us no more for certain or intimately about God than any other prophet or seer. Moreover Chalcedon ascribes to Christ a human soul, and this means that His character was human; but—and this is the point to be emphasised—that human character was therefore due to the direct impress of the divine nature upon a human soul, as the Epistle to the Hebrews declares of Christ, in words wonderfully appropriate to the issue when literally translated: "who is the character of His personality." Here is what modern evangelical thought has been feeling after, namely that the human

character of Christ is an authentic revelation of the very heart of God ; but founded not on merely subjective appraisal but on objective revelation. Then indeed Christ can be presented to men, with His widely open arms and His deeply open heart, with the conviction that this represents the eternal attitude of God towards men and discloses the heart of Ultimate Reality. This carries the further implication that true surrender to Christ will produce the same character, and thus make men like to God, and so able to be united to Him happily for ever. This is the salvation every man needs, and everywhere seeks for, which Christianity manifests, Catholic Theology defends, and Catholic devotion fosters and fulfils.

The next step to be taken is, with careful exposition and equal emphasis, to show that the graciously designed means for establishing and making permanent this union, is by eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of Man ; and this again Catholic doctrine not merely repeats but so defines and expounds as to make Holy Communion the satisfaction of desire and the centre of devotion. Here, however, there has to be overcome the difficulty that Nonconformity has been persuaded by its Protestant tutors that these words must be understood symbolically, and that communion with Christ must be an essentially spiritual thing. It is almost inevitable that in controversy the point at issue should get emphasized, while other things about which there is agreement should get left out of sight. Moreover in course of time the very phrases insisted upon get misrepresented and misunderstood by those whom we would win to their acceptance. It has to be recognized that when we say the consecrated elements become really and truly the Body and Blood of Christ, and by transubstantiation, the very word chosen to describe the change conveys a totally different meaning to the ordinary Englishman and to the trained scholastic. For to the former substance means something crude and solid, so that transubstantiation conveys to many minds what would be really trans-accidentalization. Further, it needs also to be pointed out that the word substance occurs on both sides of the equation, and moreover that it is not only the substance of Christ's Body and Blood which are conveyed in Holy Communion, and that these are not given for themselves alone. There is something given in the Sacrament which is not obtainable elsewhere, namely the substance of Christ's Body and Blood ; but these are given in order, first, that His soul, and then supremely and ultimately, His Divinity may unite us to It ; and all so that we may dwell in Him and He in us ; in short, to secure a renewal, a deepening and permanentizing of what is believed to be given in the evangelical experience. Furthermore, although when sacramental communion is impossible we recommend spiritual communion, this cannot be taken to imply that sacramental communion makes no demand upon spirituality. Everyone receives the substance of Christ's Body and

Blood *ex opere operato* ; but to come into effective communion with Christ's soul, our soul has to do something.

It could be argued further that this involves some acquaintance with the character of Christ which, with obedience to all His commands, is a condition for partaking of His Divinity. That this emphasis is sound, can be enforced from a number of unimpeachable sources that we should not need to be reminded of, but which might illuminate those who have never heard of them. We must content ourselves with quoting them and leave their exposition and application to be made by others. There is first the fact that Mass cannot be celebrated without a reading of Epistle and Gospel. It is the Sacrament of the Word ; the sacrament must be accompanied by the Word, and the sacrament is rendered the more effective as the words of Christ are known and kept. That the lower elements in the sacrament only exist for the sake of the higher is pointedly asserted in a comment on Christ's otherwise disconcerting words : " It is the Spirit that quickeneth ; the flesh profiteth nothing." The comment is to be found in our Douay version, where it declares men are " to correct their gross apprehensions of eating His flesh and drinking His blood, in a vulgar and carnal manner. . . . Dead flesh separated from the spirit in the gross manner they supposed they were to eat His flesh would profit nothing. Neither doth man's flesh ; that is to say man's natural and carnal apprehension (which refuses to be subject to the spirit and words of Christ) profit anything."

This argument might be confirmed by reference to an important definition of Pope Innocent III, of which more use might be made and which is very much *a propos* at this point. It runs as follows :

Distinguendum est tamen subtiliter inter tria, quae sunt in hoc sacramento discreta : formam visibilem, veritatem corporis, et virtutem spiritualem. Forma est panis et vini ; veritas carnis et sanguinis ; virtus unitatis et caritatis. Primum est " sacramentum et non res." Secundum est " sacramentum et res." Tertium est " res et non sacramentum." Sed primum est sacramentum geminae rei. Secundum autem est sacramentum unius, et alterius res existit. Tertium vero est res gemini sacramenti.

It might also be pointed out that the well known and discriminating words of St. Augustine are appointed to be read in the Homily for Corpus Christi. The Stanbrook translation reads :

He who abides not in Christ, and in whom Christ abides not, without doubt does not spiritually eat His flesh, nor drink His blood, though he may, in the flesh and visibly, press with his teeth the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.

Finally, the words of Père de la Taille can be quoted to a similar effect :

The union with Christ, symbolised and effected by the Eucharist, does not consist in the mere physical presence of Jesus Christ in us.

It is the effect of this physical presence, and, unlike that physical presence, is not transitory, but permanent. It consists in that spiritual fellowship which is established between Jesus Christ and ourselves. . . . The vital and never ceasing dynamic power of the flesh of Christ is that which, while preserving life in us, has for result our union with His spirit and Divinity. His flesh, the flesh of the Son of Man, is the link between our souls and His Soul, for the purpose of making us partakers, beyond His Soul itself, of the Divine Nature.¹

There is a movement, in Methodism particularly, to make the Sacrament the centre of devotion ; but this will never become popular until it is believed that there is given in the Sacrament something which cannot be otherwise obtained, namely, that same physical presence of a Divine Person which the Incarnation effected, bringing Him indeed even closer to us than when He took little children in His arms, touched the leper, raised the daughter of Jairus by the hand, and opened His wounds to the touch of St. Thomas ; for in the Sacrament Christ touches the substance of our body and blood with the substance of His, and with the purpose of opening our souls to the infusion of the divine charity by which alone we can be united to the Supreme Divinity.

It had long been recognised by enlightened evangelicals that the experience by which Christ first visits the soul, however striking it may be, grows dim in memory, is not easily renewable, and consequently can become increasingly ineffective, until its reality begins to be doubted. There is more required than to hear His voice and open the door ; if He is to remain He must sup with us and we with Him. Here then where Evangelicalism stops short, Catholicism goes on.

While it is submitted that along such lines there are possibilities of mutual understanding in the recognition of common grounds of experience, it still remains to be proved that that ground is safely marked off and cultivated only within the Catholic Church ; that if we each have certain spiritual affinities, these ought to unite us in one body, and that body has always remained, and must ever remain, visible and one. To take this step the individual has to make a great leap, while anything like corporate union has to travel a great distance. There has not only to be appreciated in Catholicism the greater use of external forms and ceremonies, the exclusive and oft-repeated use of liturgical prayers, the undefinable but quite recognisable difference of atmosphere, but there have to be left behind such forms of expression and fellowship as Nonconformity has developed ; not only the prominence given to preaching, hymn-singing and Scripture reading in their public worship, but also the group gatherings outside the more formal worship, for Bible study, religious conference and spontaneous prayer. There is no doubt that it is by such means that Nonconformity has nourished its soul

¹ *The Mystery of Faith*. By Père de la Taille. English Translation. Vol. I, p. 26.

and without them would feel spiritually starved. That they have begun to fall into disuse for various reasons is no sufficient proof that they were unhealthy or unnecessary. Yet to suggest that room might be made for them in our own system, even if only as ancillary and auxiliary, might seem to suggest unthinkable revolutions. But already, if not yet in England, there can be found groups for Bible study, Masses at which popular hymns are sung, and gatherings for preaching only. If it is true that great revivals of religion have generally been preceded by the gatherings of small groups to confer, study, and pray together, might not their encouragement have a similar sequel again?

A still greater difficulty is raised by the idea that we might attempt anything corresponding to evangelistic preaching, whether to large indoor audiences or wherever smaller numbers could be persuaded to listen in the open air, particularly if lay people wish to take some hand in this. Our preaching is inclined to be very domestic indoors and merely apologetic when addressed to outsiders or out of doors. We certainly cannot limit the preaching of the Gospel to one point, as Evangelism has often done, namely to the acceptance of Christ as Saviour there and then accomplished and sufficiently fulfilled. Nevertheless is not that point a primary, critical and central point in the Gospel? Is there nothing we can tell our unchurched masses they can and must do there and then, no acts of repentance and faith which we can commend to them as we do in *articulo mortis* to anyone? For that is where the world is morally to-day. This enters wide and debatable ground. We must content ourselves with having been so bold as to have ventured thus far, and meanwhile respectfully suggest that there is something here our religious orders were actually formed to deal with, and particularly the Dominicans and the Franciscans!

W. E. ORCHARD.

"THE MONTH" FORWARDING SCHEME

It is with special gratitude that we wish to thank all those who have assisted the Forwarding Scheme during the past year. It has meant, we know very well, a real sacrifice. But never was a gift more appreciated—to judge from the letters we receive. We are asked continually for more and more copies; we should be most grateful for further subscriptions to enable us to send them.

To certain countries publications can be sent only directly from the publishers. The Manager of THE MONTH has permission to send them. Whence the added value now of a direct subscription in favour of a missionary.

Readers who are willing to provide an annual subscription (14s.) for one to be sent direct to the more distant outposts, are asked to communicate with The Hon. Secretary, "The Month" Forwarding Scheme, 114 Mount Street, Grosvenor Square, London, W.1. Readers must enclose a stamped addressed envelope, and all names and addresses, whether of missionaries applying for "The Month," or readers providing it, should be printed in capitals.

MOTIVE-POWER IN OUR SOCIETY

A VERY modern humanist in "Towards the 20th Century"¹ sums up the last 90 years thus : " Those modern men of culture who lost traditional religion, soon discarded the materialism of science and commerce, under the lessons of experience, and now look for a spirituality which is authorised by science and yet contains religious value."

The spokesmen of the new age say that is the coming demand. Is it? Because if so, it can be met. We must take them at their word, and ask them meanwhile to stick to it.

True : millions to-day have no church, but show no antipathy to religion. " If Christianity wants me, let it come and find me, and impress and convince me," is the attitude. Many have read the reverent scientific thought of Eddington, Sherrington, Bragg, Jeans, Malinowski, J. S. Haldane, Thomson, Bergson and others. They note the anti-materialism of Joad, the human idealism of Priestley, the popularity of "The Screwtape Letters," the social-moral insight of Tawney, Christopher Dawson and the educationalist, Dr. Livingstone. They see the brainier journals and reviews set in the idealist direction (critically and unsentimentally).

That modern demand, a new spirituality, is "yearning to mix itself with life." It is seen in the characteristic new enthusiasm for a sounder world built on a humane and even spiritual basis. In this movement now you have 100 per cent. Christians (Catholic, and non-Catholic too) side by side with "secularism touched with emotion." Some do, and some don't, realise that, in Tawney's definition, "character is social ; and society, since it is the expression of character, is spiritual," not a bunch of producer-consumers kept together by officials, cashnexus, appetite, force and law. (Some men tell me they would barter their liberties to-morrow for security—but they have never tried it : three weeks of it would turn most of them into anarchist rebels).

Now comes Sir Stafford Cripps, suggesting that Christianity—and also what is called democracy—has become, for many, "an accepted *incidental* to society. We are so inured to the idea, that we are not conscious of its true implications. Yet Christ's mission was to show the world the Divine conception of the human way of life—love or brotherhood based on the fullest evaluation of others' personality. We are still a long way from applying that fundamental test in our human relationships. What we require now is a very strong leaven of men and women who will catch a violent infection of Christianity—the self-sacrificing passion of the missionary in our

¹ By H. Y. Rowth, D.Litt. University of Athens. Published Cambridge Univ. Press.

own country . . . prepared to sacrifice all, even life itself, certainly wealth and privilege, for our principles."

Whereas this dynamic and divine vision of man (his individual sacred worth as soul and person) should be at the *centre*, modern movements have elbowed it on to the circumference, as an "incidental." Politics, with indefinite goodwill and ambitious philanthropic programmes, lacks a doctrine of itself, of man, of value, and the world: while that Doctrine and Spirit are at one side of the picture, waiting to enter and inform the groping, seeking body we call mankind.

Either this Soul and Truth are going to possess and guide mankind and its social aims for the next hundred years or more—or mankind is about to fumble on hopefully or distressfully *without* it. That's the crux of our time, in a nutshell. The *social* mind everywhere feels there is something wrong about our births, education, use of capital, distribution of created goods, international fellowship, etc. It says, This shall be altered. But its motive is only dissatisfaction with the irrational, or fear of consequences. It envisages only a *re-arrangement* of things, on much the same plane. Few men ask *Why?* Few proclaim the reasons for the *Ought*. We don't hear much of sanctions, motive, the absolute ideal, or the categorical imperative: but a lot about expedience, fair-play, and ordered economy. Who will give the people a vision of an inspiring goal and end which masters our mind and satisfies our religious nature in these social strivings?

Apart from the socially-enthusiastic without a creed or philosophy, to-day there are those who are cynics about mankind: behaviourism, Freud and others have insinuated there is something shady in our impulses. Hence the low, anti-ideal estimate of humanity. But others, the logical, say: "My neighbour has no claims on me—I do nobody any harm, I pay my way. They didn't *make* me! I owe them no admiration, duty or love just because they exist." Unanswerable, in logic. That outlook, if general, would produce a wooden, egoistic, short-lived society. Love-less, Spirit-less and therefore soon hateful.

Our love of man (despite his frequent unlovability) comes really from a *higher-than-human* spirit moving among us, from realising that our fellow-men are souls too, created after the Divine image, and that none less than Christ, God and man, was incarnate and died for them and is "pleased to call us brethren." There are *no other* tenable or logical motives!

Once communities lose all of that diviner sense of what man is (despite appearances and faults), you get gradual social degeneration, under whatever civilised exterior. In the last fearless analysis, Christianity is society's Vitamin A, B, C and D. Or, as a Vatican speaker put it recently, a hard worldly system may "stop man's

deep heart for a brief time, but that heart will wake again and either break this animal order in wrath, or break through it in religious revival." Without an habitual view of man as essentially *spirit*, without some implicit sense of kinship and responsibility to a supernatural power, "human beings will sink into apes, ingenious 'civilised' apes, or else beavers, ants, or bees," as a modern thinker said. (Renan's variant of this was that only affinity with the Divine will keep mankind "a moderately good gorilla").

Millions of us, if offered a social machine for the sole satisfaction of appetite and sense, will never accept it but will do our utmost to expose, transcend, inspire and otherwise break it! Let hedonists, materialists and others remember that we who stand for the rights of the spirit *can also be* "revolutionaries." Ours is the oldest, toughest brotherhood in human annals; we have survived, outgrown, and buried many hard and sense-bound civilisations. It is as well to give fair notice of what will happen if the Human-Zoo idea tries to enclose us all. It will be Mediocrity's declaration of war on Mansoul—and Mansoul will fight! Once again, the result is a foregone conclusion. If only worldliness could be realist for a moment!

The secularist-materialist-reformist should think twice and beware of rousing the supernatural forces against him, from those who follow One who "came to cast fire on the earth." He must not indulge the naive dream, either, that he alone is social-minded. He is a late-comer, a copyist, and even so he only sees a less important segment of the facts. Christianity was, and still is, the best "ecclesia" or collectivism. It *alone* keeps alive and intelligible the mystic truth of astounding individual *worth*, without which democracy isn't even plausible. Those who do not see man in God are simply credulous if they revere and value such a transient and bewildered biped as man is, abstracted from his diviner background.

For centuries men lived in this cosmos before understanding the *physical* law of Gravitation. What we need to-day is to understand the *spiritual*, emotional principle of Gravitation which, obeyed, puts all else in its place and function. All that modern mankind require is consciousness of the *axis* they have to revolve on. We have had enough of provisional thinking and approximate solutions, enough of halfway houses and "make do." We want no more short-term loyalties and temporary rally-points. Nationalism is not enough. Materialist internationalism may be even worse. A super-insured world of consumers and producers, clamped together by a Civil Service, might be a Mappin Terrace, a universal atrophy, a hive of deadened souls, insecure after all—generating some worse mental disease than mankind even yet has known.

Those are short-cut "solutions," the impulsive answers of discontent and impatience. Such projects are like bodies without a Head—and no wonder they behave like decapitated bodies.

We like to claim we are "scientific" to-day. Few periods have been less so in their sociology. Old-fashioned scientific materialism is dead, but it lurks on now in social programmes which omit *the* one necessity, a practical foundation. Now all the time this universe *has* a moral centre, a given fulcrum. Till we are in touch with it, nothing will work well. Till we are integrated spiritually, we shall be *dis-integrated* socially: there will not be binding love, service, forbearance, lubrication, creative sympathy, and without these Law is only an armed truce and an uneasy compromise.

We want a Newton discovery in our sociology. We want the spirit that makes the dry bones live. It is easy to say the words "theocracy" and "God" are the only ultimate workable idea; but that is too indefinite. Something more concrete and human is needed—and is accessible. Some Leadership more incarnate and concentrated, near and in human history and events. Such a Captain, leading and heading our evolution, there is. He exists as a permanent, indelible fact of the universe's architecture, which is built in upon Him as on a corner-stone: and "other foundation no man can lay, but that which is laid." All moral and social movement radiates from and to Him who is "Head of every man," king of nations, simply because He by nature occupies that central master-position: first-born of creation. Nothing else gives society or church, individuals or creation, *cohesion*. In him "all things consist" and come and stay together. He is (to us) not merely God, but—what is all-important—God *manifest*, the Divine force of gravity functioning humanly too, among us, whether known or less known; for of course His power is not limited to the area of conscious Christianity.

No statesmen or social reformer has begun to know his business who has not grasped the key and clue of all living society—that it is kept going and kept together not by fear and law and force, greed and habit, but by *affection*. As much love, so much real society. Without it, one civilisation after another crumbles; and deserves to; we need shed no tears, nor suppose any mystery, when Sparta, Rome, Persia fell because they were without the primal antiseptic of enduring society—tenderness, charity, devotion, sacrificing solicitude.

"What!" asks the mundane reasoner, "you ask us to love all men? to give ourselves to a thankless multitude? You're asking the impossible."

Certainly: if you see man in the dry light of realist observation. The *facts* alone do not justify this heroism or martyrdom. Self-sacrifice (except for next of kin) is irrelevant and rarely attainable by human nature unassisted.

That is the impasse. Unless it is solved, each civilisation in turn must break up in time from natural causes. Is there a stronger cause making it possible and easy to love men and so preserve the

community indefinitely? There is one way, and only one. That is to see all men in man's infinitely lovable Head, and see His image and love in them. It can be done; millions have done it. It is no saints' monopoly; no flight of mysticism; every Christian has often felt it among his fellows, when his own eyes are clear and pierce beneath dull appearances.

What the early Christians normally felt (see the epistles' evidence), we too can and do experience. Extend that widely enough to include others, and the world's problem is solved. See the race as Christ's brethren, of whom He is the Head, "first-born of many brethren"—and what looked dubious or depressing becomes infinitely "worth while." "Facts as they are?" Faith and love are much stronger than superficially beheld facts: they make facts, and alter facts. Love imputes and *creates* objects deserving love.

Tawney, in "Religion and the Rise of Capitalism," a classic of economics, gives as the sociological solution: "Knowledge guided by Love." Well, that is the same solution as is described above.

That is "the new spirituality," the synthesis of science *and* moral value, which modern man *says* he awaits. He has rejected one after another all other substitutes or approximations as fast as they let him down. He can't live on rejections, however, a homeless mental nomad, indefinitely. A time comes for acceptance at last. Knowing and feeling with our millions of brothers and sisters who are not Catholic, we see them come short of their own generous ideal impulses because of a missing support and conductor for these floating occasional moods and dreams of good.

We have some way to go before we can bring millions of well-disposed fellow-men to the greater Self of all of us, Christ, to be charged and re-charged with the motive-power to serve mankind effectively—further than "the social contract" takes us, further than law, or tribe preference, or politics, or the larger selfishness. But we *have* already the supreme and utterly satisfactory world-key; an existing force in the world, not a theory.

More: if you benefit men for His sake, and therefore as an integral part of our religion and a condition of your eternal salvation over and above earth and time—notice that you will, in trying to redeem fellow-men (whether you fail or succeed, or partly succeed), be saving *one* eternal value, your spirit. You will be preserving among men also the witness to a morality and reality other than the earthly: in itself, the finest service to mankind. And you will be able to show staying-power, final perseverance, where the Party man or kindly rationalist will not.

The non-religious reformist or socialist, however estimable, can often succumb to disappointment ("the world gets worse, not better") when his group changes, or temporises, or loses two elections running, or loses its funds, or decreases in membership, or admits new careerists

over his head to "steal my credit," or takes office and doesn't pass its own programme, or is involved in national defeat, or is outbidden by a rival party, or splits, or is not thanked by the people. Such things are constantly happening, for the multitude are not always loyal to benefactors.

But with the man whose eyes are on the adored Head—not on the unsatisfying members—it is different. He is not dependent on their verdicts or unresponsiveness. His is a vocation, a worship going beyond time and circumstance; not a mundane enterprise subject to mundane mortal blows. Those who are not in the livery and pay of man do man the most good (Saints Paul, Francis, Benedict, Vincent de Paul, etc. etc.).

Humanity is an inadequate inspiration for a man's life, death and sacrifice (despite the self-immolation of revolutionaries or Japanese warriors). "Don't," said Kipling, "give your heart for a dog to tear." It is even more vital not to give your heart for *man* to tear. Social reform circles and politics and "revolution" groups (no less than Capitalist boards and commercial and other staffs) are, if only humanist and humanitarian, *very* human, believe me; "all-too-human." I have seen eager-hearts and romantics cured by them of Man-worship, and alas, turn cynical or sad. Why? Simply because man *as such*, on the naturalistic mundane plane, cannot take this worship; obviously does not—as a biological phenomenon—deserve it. If man is a mortal animal, the extreme sacrifice of the spirit for him is exorbitant, an infatuation, unreal. And it will not endure therefore, because the crux comes when a fatigued altruist stops to ask, "Who and what *are* these beings for whom I'm wearing myself out? Have they a *final* value, or are they transient phenomena, part of the earth's fauna? Are they a Divine spark, or protoplasm?"

See how sad big-hearted men like Carlyle, Morris, Ruskin, Hardie and Wells become after years only on the perishable iron-rations of humanism. "Mostly fools," said one of them of men at large. "Homo sapiens!" scolds another. . . .

No: men who are going to give themselves for human kind till death deserve and have got to have different sustenance from that,—to eat a better bread and drink of a finer fountain. The *Christian* "enthusiasm of humanity," as Seeley called it in "Ecce Homo," is effective and lasting because it comes from an inexhaustible watershed: a power from above man is shed on man: "the love of Christ constrains us."

It is proof against real frustration and failure, because it is not swayed by success or results. Its heart and soul is in *the serving*, and on the further event, the Divine "Well done, good and faithful servant." At its best, such a spirit thrives on rebuffs, delays or misunderstanding. True, our share of it may wilt awhile under ordeals, but it can be "renewed day by day." And what force is it that

overcomes the world, but faith? What can make the apparently commonplace or heedless faces crowding round us seem lovable or worth our sacrifice?—only the seeing the Christ in them, the image of God, the undying entity. (This solution of the enigma is in those medieval parables of someone doing an outcast good—and finding that it was Our Lord, an angel unawares, or a masked saint).

Ambitious programmes, promises, plans and claims just now swarm upon us. Politicians are magnificently giving away in advance what society probably hasn't got. No matter: a social humanitarian afflatus is on us. It is only a case of wishing and we shall all be in an earthly paradise. May it come true! May half of it come true! I do not raise the cashier's demur: "Where is the money to come from?" for that can be argued and perhaps solved. I do ask: "Where is the permanent *moral capital* coming from? I see the engine: would you mind showing me the steam and the boiler? I like the model of the body and apparatus quite a lot—and now, is the *spirit* anywhere about?" Except the Divine Spirit build and inform the house, it will be a house of cards and card indexes.

That is where the eloquent and positive lay reformers of last century and this fell short. Even to-day—so childlike and superficial are some grown men—they think it generous to admit Motive-power into "a place" somewhere in their mechanism: not to make it *go*, and keep it going, but to appease the demand of those odd people "the churches!" No State on earth will ever get *continuously* unselfish service, coupled with respect for the personalities served, except as Religion enters into it. Let the State swarm with caretakers, inspectors, subsidies, and officials (as many fancy they want it to) and it would still, as Tawney says, "break down through their neglect of the truism that, since even quite common men have souls, no increase in material wealth will compensate them for arrangements which impair their self respect or freedom." The most collectivist State is at the mercy of the *spirit* of its servants and the reaction of the people to those Officials. Only honesty, love, idealism, and all we call goodness will lubricate *any* organisation and keep it functioning long. All social matters therefore wait on the prior question of faith, ideal allegiance, spirit, devotedness.

That is mere elementary Architecture. All else is impressionist hurry and jerry-building.

Once the major and awake part of mankind see, in Christ, God's monarch and head for the race, its Leader and Goal, all sorts of mere external systems, apparatus and constitutions will work well. These have a very minor vital importance then. Where men are devoted to fellow man for the sake of their eternal Head and living Ideal, details of structure modify themselves easily and promptly to express the informing mind.

So, as a political writer and publicist by profession, as a world-

patriot by persuasion, I submit to *all* shades of thought, without exception, that now before the war is over and before the problems of resettlement are unloaded upon us, we cease to talk of "society" as an abstraction, of "God" as an abstraction, or to think of them separately: let us have done with words which win no love or allegiance, remembering what the historian Macaulay said: "It was only before Deity embodied in human Form, among men, that the prejudices of the synagogue, the doubts of the academy, the pride of the portico, and the fasces of the lictor, and the swords of thirty legions were humbled," *Ecce Homo!* To the human race, we say, Behold your King.

All this is practical politics, and the only politics that is going to meet the otherwise over-complex situation, This is that "new spirituality" founded on the rock of experience, history, and human psychology, which inquirers and social idealists are said to be awaiting.

W. J. BLYTON.

To the first-century Christian the Roman Empire was an ungodly thing. With its complex civilization, its cultured this-worldiness and its thousands of petty deities, it was for him the "world" *par excellence*: in fact, it was almost devil and world and flesh combined. He felt himself a "martyr," that is a witness, long before he might have to suffer martyrdom. He was a witness unto Christ in a society and in surroundings as far removed as could be imagined from any Christian ideal. But, as the Faith spread and the number of Christians was more in evidence, this attitude gradually altered. Pagan Rome was still the great Babylon, the sewer of error and iniquity: but out of the sewer, they now considered, something might be salvaged. There were occasional bits of good embedded in the evil, and throughout the long night of pagandom a light had flashed or flickered intermittently: and this light was held to be a faint foretelling of the Gospel message. Christian scholars began to express their doctrines in the language of ancient philosophy: Plato was thought of as an Attic Moses, speaking Greek instead of Hebrew: and many strange oracles of seers and priestesses were understood to refer to Christ, and multiplied in alarming fashion. Chiefly because of his Fourth Eclogue, a short poem which predicted the birth of a godlike child and an age of gold he was to inaugurate, the poet Virgil was ranked loosely with the prophets. At Rheims or Rouen in an antiphonal sequence during a feast-day Mass, Virgil was summoned as the "Vates gentilium," the prophet of the Gentiles, to give testimony to Christ: the reply came back in the verses of what was later called the Messianic Eclogue. There is an old tradition that St. Paul, during his first days in Italy at Puteoli, visited Virgil's tomb and there exclaimed: "What a saint I would have made of thee, greatest of all poets." The *anima cortese mantovana* is not only Dante's poetic master but his guide also through the circles of the Inferno: but, that journey once complete, the old yields place to new, the pagan Virgil to Beatrice, the Christian.

(From "Roman Vignettes"—THE MONTH, October, 1938.)

PORTUGAL UNDER SALAZAR

IT is extremely difficult in this country to learn anything about the extraordinary *risorgimento* of Portugal during the last eighteen years. There is an English version of some of Salazar's earlier speeches with the title "Doctrine and Action," and a translation of Antonio Ferro's revealing interviews with Salazar. But those interviews were ten years ago, and much has happened since then. Mr. Michael Derrick, in 1938, published a really excellent little book called "The Portugal of Salazar," which gave a very lucid description of the corporative organisation which is still in process of formation in Portugal. But that little book, I believe, has been out of print for some time, and it is now somewhat out of date.

Catholics are, perhaps, better informed about Portugal than any other section of the community though, perhaps that is not saying much. From time to time, their weekly papers give them some news of what is happening there though, naturally, this news is usually of a religious nature. Our daily press neglects Portugal in a truly scandalous way and, as a rule, only wakes up with a jolt when the financial interests of British shareholders in Portugal appear to be threatened. When Salazar makes one of his rare speeches, the *Times* may be relied upon to make a reference to it and even to give an extract from it. But as such an extract is removed from its context, and Salazar's speeches are carefully thought-out logical disquisitions—it is the only word for them—the extract often gives a completely false idea of the tenor of the speech as a whole. We have had two examples of this undeliberate misrepresentation in recent times, one early last year in the Timor episode; another, not long ago, when Salazar broadcast to his people about the position and difficulties of Portugal in the present world conflict.

Apart from such scanty references in the daily press, the general public is left completely in the dark about Portugal. There are, unfortunately, more frequent references in a certain section of the weekly press. One of these may well be quoted here. It is taken from the *Tribune* of June 4th and is concerned with the 17th anniversary "of Portugal's so-called revolution. Dictator Salazar rose to power and with him something which is not very different to Italian Fascism in mentality, if not in efficiency" (I don't know whether this is intended as a reflection upon Salazar or upon Mussolini!). "At every great crisis during these seventeen years Salazar's Portugal sided against democracy and also against the friends of her British ally. Salazar's Portugal abetted Mussolini in his aspirations. It supplied Franco with officers and equipment during the Spanish Civil War. It broke

off relations with the Czechoslovak Republic because it refused to supply guns to the rebels. It declared for neutrality when Poland and France were invaded, and it became a happy hunting ground for Nazi intrigue and propaganda during the crucial days of the Battle for Britain." There are six specific statements here, and they are all thoroughly wrong. Such mischievous nonsense is fed to an undiscerning and indiscriminating section of the public and may, if it is not counteracted, do incalculable harm.

The trouble is, of course, that Portugal is not a democracy of the type which these people favour. Worse still, the Portuguese, and especially Salazar, will have no truck with Bolshevism and do not hesitate to say so in terms which cannot be misunderstood. Worst of all, perhaps, Salazar is a Christian, not in the vague sense in which that word is now currently used, but in the most complete, definite, and uncompromising sense. His principles are the principles of the encyclicals, plain and simple, and, I believe, without reservation. He bases all his social action upon them, and he will not sacrifice them to considerations of expediency, political or otherwise. Our left-wing publicists cannot understand such a man, and because they cannot understand him they do not like him. The *New Statesman* is not so virulent as the *Tribune*. If it refers to Portugal at all, it talks about "clerical Fascism" or "pseudo-Fascism," and leaves it at that. "Give a dog a bad name" even if the name doesn't mean anything, seems to be one of the guiding principles of the *New Statesman*.

Why does all this matter? It does matter tremendously, in my opinion. It matters, first of all, because it is unjust, and secondly, because it is so detrimental to the best interests of this country. When this war is over, perhaps before, we shall have to make a choice. We all know it. More and more it looks as though that choice would have to be between two opposing types of materialism. I need not specify them. Is there no alternative? If there is an alternative, has it any chance of being recognised and accepted? I can, I believe, answer the first of those two questions. I am not so sure about the second.

I believe it is essential that we should give much study to what I have called, borrowing the expression from some Frenchman, "the Portuguese Experiment." I was recently asked whether I thought that we could find in Portugal a "blue print" for our own future use. My answer was "Definitely, No!" Our circumstances are quite different from those of the Portuguese. They are, predominantly, a peasant people, still very largely illiterate. They will change, of course, inevitably, as the rest of the world will change, and they will develop, but not as we have developed. Their traditions, except in the field of maritime adventure, are unlike ours. We have, as Salazar has pointed out, a democratic tradition of which we may be proud. Perhaps I should say, a tradition of democratic institutions,

which is not at all the same thing. Portugal, as anyone who studies its history must admit, also has a democratic tradition, but it is of a very different type from ours. Its experience of what we call "democratic institutions" was unmistakably lamentable and disastrous.

No ! If we *must* have a "blue print," we shall not find it in Portugal. What then, shall we find ? We shall find an example of a State which has been deliberately built up on Christian principles—the principles which we seem to find it so necessary to acclaim in theory, and so convenient to forget in practice. We shall find an organisation of society which is not concerned with the acceptance of verbal fetiches; in which the solemn enunciation of the words "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity" is not received with a fanfare of trumpets, while the reality, such as it is, behind those words, is ignored. We shall find a State which solemnly and determinedly asserts the supremacy of the law of God above all human law and all human institutions; which insists that the end for which organised society must strive is the end for which God created man ; which sees in man, not an isolated individual with a vote, but a person, a personality, with a soul to save, and spiritual aspirations which cry as loudly for satisfaction as his economic needs.

It is, I think, a misfortune, that the aspect of Salazar's work which receives most consideration in this country is that of his economic and financial achievements. He has, apparently, worked something like a miracle in this field, but the miracle is not what it is usually assumed to be. He has, as he says himself, simply run his country's household on the lines which every good housewife follows in her domestic economy, spending what he has to spend, neither too much nor too little, and refusing to be inveigled into extravagance by the blandishments of the hire-purchase huckster. In these days, it does indeed seem a miracle that any statesman should act in such a way.

It is not so much to the economic rehabilitation of Portugal that I would seek to draw attention as to the spiritual resurgence of the Portuguese nation. It was in danger of losing its soul. The chaos and confusion, the corruption and disorder, of Portugal during the hundred years from 1820 to 1926 were such that many even of the best Portuguese gave up hope. The Portuguese intellectuals formed a coterie in which they called themselves the *vencidos de vida*, those for whom life had proved too much. The great historian Herculano buried himself in the country, and cried in anguish that there was nothing left to do but die. And many good men, after years of struggle, abandoned hope—their religious groundwork had been undermined—and sought death at their own hands.

If these men had studied their own country's history in any other light than that of the materialism which they had borrowed from outside, they might have taken a different, and more optimistic view.

The soul of Portugal was not dead. It remained alive in the great mass of the rural population, bewildered and helpless as that population was in the hands of misguided politicians. It remained alive in the army, in the hearts of a few simple-minded men who still placed their country's interests above their own, and did not consider their own feelings.

And at Coimbra, the university city of Portugal, when things were at their very worst, in the second decade of this century, a society of members of the university was formed to study and discuss the encyclicals of Leo XIII. It was called the C.A.D.C., the Academic Centre of Christian Democracy. Among its members, and very prominent in its activities, were two young men, Antonio de Oliveira Salazar, an ex-seminarist and the son of a peasant, and Manuel Gonçalves Cerejeira, an historian, with whom Salazar shared rooms. The one is now Prime Minister of Portugal; the other, Cardinal Patriarch of Lisbon. They had a very rough time. The offices of the Centre were broken into, and its papers thrown into the streets. At Oporto, where the young Salazar gave an address in 1914, there was a riot. He had been bold enough to say that *forms* of government were of secondary importance—a point of view which he has always maintained—and that “democracy cannot subsist when it grants privileges to one class at the expense of another.”

Salazar, after taking his degree, stayed on at Coimbra, and became a Professor of Economics. He was there when, after a successful (and bloodless) coup d'état by the army in May, 1926, the military leaders were looking round for a Minister of Finance who might rescue the country from complete bankruptcy. It appears that somebody mentioned the name of Salazar and, though he was not known except by his writings on economic subjects, nobody could suggest anyone else. General Gomes da Costa sent for the young man. He stayed in office for five days.

So far as I know, Salazar has never made public what happened during those five days. But it is not difficult to guess. He probably insisted on strict economies in governmental expenditure, and nothing could have been more unpopular. The dictatorship thought it could not afford to be unpopular. On the evening of the fifth day, Salazar caught the train to Coimbra and went back to his teaching of Economics. Even to-day his name still appears in the list of Coimbra professors.

The Dictatorship, however, could not cope with the financial chaos. It was worried. In Portugal, financial soundness and good government are regarded, if not as synonymous, as essentially interdependent. It was a long time since Portugal had been financially sound, and it was also a long time since it had been well governed. The dictatorship was anxious to be regarded as a good government. Salazar was again sent for, in 1928. This time he would come on

his own terms, or not at all. The situation was so desperate that he insisted on dictatorial powers over all Government expenditure. This was distasteful, but there was no alternative. He was given his powers.

When he assumed office as Minister of Finance, Salazar made a very short but significant speech. At the end of it he said these words: "I shall always be prepared to justify the choice of the course which I propose to take, and to explain the motives and significance of all that is not clear. All the necessary information which will enable the country to pass judgment on any situation will always be at its disposal. I know quite well what I want and where I am going, but let it not be expected that I shall reach the goal in a few months. For the rest, the country may study, it may make suggestions, it may discuss and it may raise objections, but when the time comes and I have to issue instructions, let it obey."

In those few words we may find one clue to Salazar's strength. He *always* knows where he is going and what he wants. He is never blown out of his course by the storms of transitory public opinion. What is more, he always says what he thinks, makes no promises which he cannot fulfil, and lays no store by popularity. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to find any other statesman of whom so much could be said. Perhaps this tenacity of purpose and of principle sometimes makes it difficult for the politicians of other countries to understand Salazar and so to deal with him. They just cannot understand a man who always means what he says, and who will always do what he promises.

Two years passed. Salazar did what he had come to do. He balanced Portugal's budget. The financial crisis passed though, of course, there were difficulties for some years. But he did not go. This man, this quiet, unassuming, unambitious professor, without a party, without a press, who had all the time to propose and carry out unpopular measures, instead of retiring to that academic life he so much loves, became President of the Council of Ministers.

The dictatorship of the generals had been a temporary expedient. It had been a house cleaning, not a house furnishing. Now it was necessary to give Portugal a sound political and economic structure. There must be a new Constitution, for the old one had broken down and was out of harmony with Portuguese tradition. Salazar announced the threefold policy upon which the new order was to be based. It was a policy of truth, of sacrifice, and of national spirit. The Government should be open and frank in its dealings with the people; its actions should be in harmony with its declared principles. The people, for their part, must treat the Government with equal honesty. The present generation must be prepared to make sacrifices for the sake of generations to come: it must not, as it had so long been doing, try to escape immediate inconvenience and hardship by

mortgaging the future. And the interest of the nation must be supreme. It must be given precedence over all individual and sectional interests, political and economic. To this end the Government must be freed from dependence upon party.

This was a tremendous break with the immediate past. The political parties, with the secret societies which gave them their orders, had been the ruin of Portuguese democracy. Between 1910, when the Republic was founded, and 1926, when the present régime began, there were no less than sixteen revolutions and forty changes of Ministry. Those sixteen years had offered an unparalleled spectacle of corruption, disorder, assassination, industrial strife, and religious persecution. It was impossible to rebuild on the old lines upon such a foundation. The old parties, when their members could reach sufficient agreement among themselves, which was seldom, produced brilliant schemes of social reform. These never progressed beyond the stage of memoranda. Salazar made no glittering promises, not because he is not anxious for measures of social security and reform, but because he knew that the country, with its scanty resources, could not carry them out.

Portugal, under Salazar, did not become a social "early paradise" overnight. It has not done so after seventeen years. There is still great poverty in Portugal; there are still many illiterates. Many measures of social improvement have been foreshadowed, but not yet carried out. The fact that this is so, I find, seems to act as a cold douche upon some who, thinking that they agree wholeheartedly with Salazar's principles, find, when they visit Portugal, that so much of what they hoped to see, remains invisible; that so much of what they regard as essential still remains undone.

Yet Salazar has not failed; he has not changed or departed from his principles. He will not gamble upon the future; he will not risk sacrificing the coming generation for the sake of the present. He will not surrender to expediency. In other words, he will do the essential things; he will lay the foundations, he will create the proper mentality, but he will not spend money which he has not got, and he will not encourage the country to run before it can walk.

Salazar has been much criticised for this attitude. One of his critics, a man who himself had been Minister of Finance, spoke of him contemptuously as "a poor Benedictine lay-brother." He may have taken this as a compliment, but it was certainly not so intended. As I said before, he controls his country's finances like a good housewife, refusing to indulge in luxuries which Portugal cannot afford, even some of those things which almost come into the category of necessities, so long as there is no money to pay for them. He will not borrow money from abroad. Indeed, one of his achievements which is, perhaps, even more remarkable than his continued series of balanced budgets, is the full repayment of the foreign floating

debt of Portugal. At the present time, to all intents and purposes, Portugal has no foreign debt.

But Salazar has done a great deal. He has reorganised the administrative services and got rid of a locust-like swarm of useless and expensive officials. It was a difficult business and very unpopular amongst the most vocal class of oppositionists, the sinecurists themselves. It was especially difficult because he needed single-minded men of experience for the essential posts, and they were hard to find in view of the ludicrous educational background of the Portuguese middle class. He has improved the public services and provided, so far as he was able, for the adequate defence of the country and its dominions overseas. Portugal now has a very small but an efficient and well-disciplined navy. He has built schools and established many hundreds of centres for primary education—they are hardly schools in the regular sense of the word—in remote rural districts which had previously never known such a thing. He has enormously increased agricultural production, and paid particular attention to the works of irrigation which, in some districts, are so badly needed. Space will not allow me to extend this list of the New State's achievements.

I must say something about the Constitution. It was adopted by plebiscite, without the assistance of anything like a Gestapo, in 1933. A draft of it was published in the newspapers a considerable time beforehand, and people were invited to comment on it and make suggestions or objections. When the final draft was prepared, the country was invited to take it or leave it. It was very definitely accepted. There were 1,330,268 voters on the register. Of these, 1,292,864 voted for the adoption of the Constitution. Only 6,090 voted against it.

The Constitution of the New Portuguese State provides a Republican form of government, with a President, elected for seven years by popular vote; a Council of Ministers, whose President is chosen by the Head of the State; a National Assembly, and a Corporative Chamber. The Head of the State has ultimate powers not unlike those of the President of the United States, but so long as the Prime Minister enjoys his confidence, it is the Prime Minister who governs. The National Assembly consists of ninety members, elected by direct suffrage every four years. Its main function is to control the national expenditure, and it must decide matters in which questions of national sovereignty are involved. It has no control, other than ultimate financial control, over the Government, which is in no way responsible to it. Most of the legislation takes the form of "decree-laws" which are promulgated by the Head of the State over the signatures of the responsible Ministers. Individual Ministers are responsible to the Prime Minister, and he only to the President. I should mention the very important fact that any citizen who considers that a Govern-

ment Department is acting in an unconstitutional manner in his regard—and that includes any infringement of the rights ascribed to individuals in the Constitution—has the right to take the matter to the appropriate courts of law and, if the courts uphold his contention, the Government's action is annulled.

The principles of the Constitution are perfectly clear. The citizen is regarded, not as an isolated unit, but always as the member of a group. He is, in the first place, the member of a family. The family is considered to be the natural and fundamental basis of society, and its integrity is one of the main objects of the New State's concern. It is, to use the words of the Constitution, "the first basis of social education, discipline and harmony, and the backbone of the political order." Usually, the individual is also a member of some occupational group, and as such he becomes a member of a Corporation. Finally, he is also a member of a purely local group based on neighbourhood. In all these capacities he has a voice in the affairs of the nation.

To put it briefly, the Corporative system is intended to embrace not only all the economic activities of the nation, but moral and cultural activities also. It is still in process of formation and far from complete. Salazar would be the last person in the world to think of imposing an elaborate, ready-made organisation upon a people unprepared for it, and then using the Government's authority to galvanise it into activity. He began by setting up corporative institutions in those industries which already possessed a rudimentary degree of organisation, especially the sardine, port wine, olive oil, and other similar industries, upon which Portugal's export trade very largely depends. At the bottom of the Corporative structure are the local associations of employers and employees which, at this level, are separate. At the top is the Corporative Chamber, in which all the economic, administrative, moral and cultural activities of the Nation are represented: This Corporative Chamber is *not* a legislative body; its functions are purely advisory. All Bills which come before the National Assembly must be submitted for its consideration and opinion before they can be discussed, but the Assembly need not necessarily accept the opinion offered. It almost invariably does. The Government, too, before making a decree-law, may consult the Corporative Chamber, and not infrequently does so, but it is not obliged to.

Production is being organised more and more upon this corporative foundation. The idea behind it all is that production cannot be considered a private affair, simply as a means by which workers make a living, and employers a profit. It is a matter for private enterprise, but this must be regulated and controlled for the benefit of the nation as a whole. Salazar believes that, normally, an industry is capable of managing its own affairs through the corporative organisation.

He will not allow the State, as such, to intervene, unless it becomes obvious that the essential interests of the whole nation demand such action. Even during the war he has been very unwilling to depart from this attitude.

I must say a few words about the Portuguese Colonial Empire, for it is impossible to realise the position of Portugal without taking it into consideration. Everybody, I suppose, knows something of the astounding contribution which Portugal, through her discoverers and colonial statesmen, made to the world in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Not so many realise that the Portuguese Colonial Empire to-day is not only very large, but particularly enterprising and flourishing. It is, in fact, unique in many respects. The Portuguese refuse to consider their territories overseas as "possessions," as lands to be exploited for the advantage of plutocrats, greater or smaller, at home. These territories are regarded as an integral part of Portugal, as lands in which Portugal has a civilising and Christianising mission to fulfil. Consequently, the Portuguese never talk about educating the native peoples for self-government. It is their business, they consider, to make the natives good Portuguese. They do not recognise any colour bar. The colonies, if I may, for convenience, call them by that name, are vital to Portugal. They provide an outlet for surplus population and, at the same time, make possible a colonial trade which will, in the future, contribute to the prosperity of both continental and overseas Portugal.

One of the first tasks of the New State was to set this overseas house in order. This was not easy. The colonies had been neglected for years, and many vested interests had established themselves. There had been no continuity of policy at the Ministry of the Colonies. Sometimes, the colonies had been left too much to their own devices; sometimes there had been continual interference from people at home who had no real conception of the problems involved. Finances were in an even more chaotic state than in Portugal itself. The position is now very different. Salazar himself took over the portfolio of the Colonies for a time, and promulgated the Colonial Act of 1930. This was, in some measure, the counterpart of the Constitution at home. He was followed as Minister by Dr. Armindo Monteiro, whom we were privileged to have with us in London as the Ambassador of his country. It was his work—and he accomplished it with remarkable success—to do for the finances of the Colonies what Salazar was doing for those of the Mother Country. Dr. Monteiro did much more than this. The system of colonial administration which he created is a model of its kind.

With regard to the Portuguese colonies I will add only this. There is much talk nowadays of putting colonies under some form of international mandate. Colonies, it is fondly imagined, can be most effectively administered and developed by committee. Some

put this rather vague idea forward from misplaced considerations of humanitarianism; others because they hope to gain a position of advantage for their own countries from the composition of the committee. There is also talk, usually equally vague, about access for everybody to raw materials. This was the cry of Germany before the war. As Salazar recently pointed out, so far as the Portuguese colonies are concerned, there has never been any difficulty about raw materials, except that of paying for them. The cry for raw materials has always served as a cloak for ambitions of political domination. The Portuguese will never agree that others can, or will, govern their colonies better than themselves. They are not impressed by the committee notion. I believe they are right.

There are many other subjects I should have liked to consider, had there been space. There are the relations between Church and State in Portugal, and the concordat which was recently signed with the Holy See. There is the extremely realistic and wise policy of Salazar and Dr. Monteiro—who was then Minister for Foreign Affairs—during the Civil War in Spain. There is the nature of the Portuguese Youth Movement, and the aspirations of Portuguese youth. I have not mentioned the Statute of Labour which aims at securing decent conditions of life for the Portuguese worker. I have not spoken of the Government's refusal to permit strikes and lock-outs, of the strict censorship of the press, of the position of those who oppose the Government. Above all, and this I regret more than the rest, I have said something about Portugal, but very little about Salazar, the man. The other day, I came across a little book by a certain Prieto, which was really dealing with the Civil War in Spain, but which gave a few words to Salazar. It began by calling him a Jesuit. It went on to describe him as a first-class modern inquisitor, and pictured his delight at hanging up by the thumbs people who disagreed with him, and the desperate tortures which were inflicted in dark, evil-smelling, underground dungeons. Salazar once said, using a French expression, that he had to eat his daily dish of toads. It is of such charming calumnies that such a dish of toads is compounded.

I have made it my business during the last few years to make a careful study of Salazar's life, his principles, and his acts. The more I do so, the more I admire and revere the man. I am greatly tempted to use more extravagant words. He has deserved well of his country and of the world. He deserves our admiration, our sympathy, and our prayers. If there is any sanity left in the world when the present war ends, I should like to think that Salazar might be called upon to contribute the benefit of his unfailing wisdom and moderation to the councils which will reshape the world.

I will end where I began. Here, in this country, we are looking with anxiety to the future. We are concerned about the fate of

Christian civilisation, menaced from so many angles. Those of us who call ourselves Christians have a tremendous responsibility in the matter. In these days, when a variegated array of social panaceas is dangled before us like a carrot before a donkey's nose ; when we are invited to welcome a social order based on any fantastic notion from a modified anglicised Bolshevism to the crude individualism of a Sir Ernest Benn, should we not plead and work for a policy which, like Salazar's, is based on truth, on sacrifice, and on the subordination of individual and sectional interests to the greater interests of our national community ?

Portugal, though she does not like to be told so, is a little country. The greatness of her people, of whom we have troubled to know so little, more than makes up for her size. She has been our very faithful ally for six hundred years. She is our ally to-day, and not even in our darkest days, least of all then, has she sought to evade the obligations of her alliance with us. It seems to me that the least we can do is to try to understand her better, to appreciate her problems, and to look with sympathy upon her present difficult situation. And for our own sakes, we shall do well to look closely at the "Portuguese Experiment" and see whether we may not find in it the germs of a solution for the problems which will confront us, with overwhelming urgency, in the near future.

LUSOFILO.

Your enjoyment of the world is never right, till every morning you awake in Heaven ; see yourself in your Father's Palace ; and look upon the skies, the earth, and the air as Celestial Joys ; having such a reverend esteem of all, as if you were among the Angels. The bride of a monarch, in her husband's chamber, hath no such cause of delight as you.

You never enjoy the world aright, till the Sea itself floweth in your veins, till you are clothed with the heavens, and crowned with the stars ; and perceive yourself to be the sole heir of the whole world, and more so, because men are in it who are every one sole heirs as well as you. Till you can sing and rejoice and delight in God, as misers do in gold, and Kings in sceptres, you never enjoy the world.

Till your spirit filleth the whole world, and the stars are your jewels ; till you are as familiar with the ways of God in all ages as with your walk and table ; till you are intimately acquainted with that shady nothing out of which the world was made ; till you love men so as to desire their happiness, with a thirst equal to the zeal of your own ; till you delight in God for being good to all : you never enjoy the world. Till you more feel it than your private estate, and are more present in the hemisphere considering the glories and the beauties there, than in your own house. Till you remember how lately you were made, and how wonderful it was when you came into it : and more rejoice in the palace of your glory, than if it had been made but to-day morning.

(THOMAS TRAHERNE ; *Centuries of Meditations.*)

CATHOLICS AND THE COMING EDUCATION BILL

REFLECTIONS ON THE WHITE PAPER AND THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

THE proposals of the Government's White Paper on Educational Reconstruction, that were published in July, are a clear indication of the framework of the Education Bill that is to be introduced presumably this coming autumn. When the Paper was issued, the reports of the Fleming Committee on the Public Schools and of the McNair Committee on the recruitment and training of teachers were not yet available; the findings of the Norwood Committee on "The Curriculum and Examinations in Secondary Schools" were made public shortly after the White Paper had appeared. Some sections of the Paper, for instance, those dealing with post-school education and with the Youth Service, are sketchy and tentative; but, on the whole, the Paper does show us what the President of the Board of Education intends to bring before the House of Commons and hopes to have made law.

These proposals may be summarised as follows :—

- (i) The school leaving age is to be raised to 15, without the arrangement for exceptions made in the 1936 Act; the age is to be further extended to 16 at some later date.
- (ii) Education is to be organized in three progressive stages, to be known as *primary*, *secondary* and *further* education. Each Local Education Authority will have to make a comprehensive survey of the existing provision and the present and prospective needs of its own area and submit its development plans to the Board of Education.
- (iii) Primary education covers the period up to the age of 11 or 12. The age of compulsory school attendance is not to be lowered but remains at 5. But Local Education Authorities will have the duty to provide, or aid the supply of, such nursery schools as the Board of Education may deem necessary. This is not, however, to interfere with the provision of nursery classes, for children under 5, in infants' schools.
- (iv) Wherever possible, there should be separate schools for infants (from 5 to 8) and juniors (from 8 to 11).
- (v) At about the age of 11 comes the change from the junior to the senior school. The Special Place examination is to be abolished. Children will be assessed and graded according to their previous school records and possibly, also by means of intelligence tests, "due regard being had to their parents' wishes and the careers they have in mind." At the age of 13, there will be a further revision and facilities for transfer to a different type of secondary school, if the original choice prove to have been faulty.

- (vi) All children from 11 to 15 (and later till 16) are to receive *secondary* education. There will be three kinds of secondary school: the *grammar* school continuing the traditions of the grammar and humanistic secondary school; the *modern* school, a development of the Senior Schools which grew originally from the upper forms of elementary schools; and, finally, the *technical* school, an extension of the Junior Technical Schools which came into being first in 1905. All three types of secondary school will be conducted under a single code of regulations; and no fees will be paid in any secondary school for the maintenance of which Local Education Authorities are responsible. Power is also to be given to these Authorities to provide boarding schools and hostels, where they are considered to be necessary or advisable.
- (vii) Education is not to cease at 15 (and later at 16). All young people, from 15 to 18, will be required to attend an appropriate centre for part-time further education, unless they are in full-time attendance at school or otherwise under suitable part-time instruction. These centres will be known as "Young People's Colleges," and it is hoped that they will serve as a nucleus for social and cultural activity as well as for technical and academic formation. "At first at any rate attendance would be limited to a day a week or its equivalent. This is clearly a minimum."
- (viii) Finally, a passing reference is made to the provision of Adult Education, in which "an ultimate training in democratic citizenship must be sought."

These are the general proposals outlined in the White Paper. What concerns us here is the relevance of these proposals to religious education in general and, in particular, the problems created by the White Paper for Catholic schools.

In its third section the Paper starts with the admission that

There has been a very general wish, not confined to representatives of the Churches, that religious education should be given a more defined place in the life and work of the schools, springing from the desire to revive the spiritual and personal values in our society and in our national tradition.

In order that this admirable result may be achieved throughout the length and breadth of Britain's national schools, there is to be a "corporate act of worship" at the beginning of each primary and secondary schoolday, and also definite religious instruction. Naturally, the old conscience clause still remains in force. Parents will be able to withdraw their children from both the act of worship and the instruction, if they have such a mind. Yes, but what character is this religious instruction to assume? Here we meet with the "agreed syllabus"—a recent arrangement. In the words of the White Paper, "provision will be made for such a syllabus to be drafted by those who can speak for the Church of England, the Free Churches, the teachers and the Authority"—possibly a somewhat comprehensive gathering of religious experts. All parents who can be satisfied with this kind of religious instruction, need have no further worries.

Their financial burden will be taken from their shoulders. In other words, a very broad Protestant syllabus is to be made obligatory in all the schools of Britain. Catholics do not complain about this, provided that there is no attempt to impose this Protestant system upon their children and that they are not *penalised* for following the dictates of their conscience and demanding their own Catholic schools.

Now, let us turn to the sections that deal with the voluntary schools, under which heading all Catholic schools are considered. After a brief history of education in Britain, to which later we shall return, the following proposals are adumbrated.

In the first place, it is proposed that the provisions of the 1936 Act shall be re-opened. "The effect of this will be," so runs the document, "that *it will be open to Authorities* to enter into agreements, or to resuscitate agreements already made, for grants between 75 per cent. and 50 per cent. of the cost of any of the projects, proposals for which were submitted by Managers or promoters within the time limit prescribed in the Act." On this particular point, fairness compels us to refer back to Mr. Butler's own analysis of pre-war conditions. "It will be open to Authorities"—nothing more is suggested. He informs us that the 1936 Act "enabled but did not compel" Authorities to give this assistance. What was the result? "Owing to the inability of many Managers to raise their share of the cost, to the dislike by some of the increased control given to Local Education Authorities and to the unwillingness of a few Local Educational Authorities to subsidise denominational schools, only 519 proposals were put forward under the 1936 Act (289 of these were in respect of Roman Catholic Schools). *Of these proposals only 37 have materialised.*" Thirty-seven out of more than 500—Mr. Butler can scarcely be aggrieved if we declare ourselves unconvinced by this display of generosity. The new proposals offer nothing more material than the pious wish that "it will be open to Authorities."

Existing schools are faced, in the White Paper, with the following alternatives :

They may become *Controlled Schools*. If they are unable or unwilling to meet half the cost of the alterations and improvements needed to bring the buildings up to the latest modern requirements, and also of the continuing external repair of the fabric, all financial obligations will pass to the Authority. This means that the power of appointing teachers will pass to the Authority. The Managers will be *consulted* about the appointment of the head teacher and there will some reserved teachers. These teachers will give denominational teaching for two periods a week. Apart from these two periods, all religious instruction will be according to the Protestant agreed syllabus. It must also be remembered that, in such controlled schools, two-thirds of the Managers will be appointed by the Local Education Authority, and only one-third by the religious body to which the school at present belongs.

Putting it into black and white this means that, if any Catholic school cannot find 50 per cent. of the money necessary for bringing its buildings up to the latest requirements of educational efficiency, it will pass to the Local Educational Authority. That Authority will then accept full financial responsibility for the school and appoint two-thirds of the school's Managers. There is no guarantee that these would be Catholics or even sympathetic towards Catholicism. But, even under the most favourable conditions, the Managers will only be consulted about the appointment of the head teacher; again, there is no suggestion that he or she would be a Catholic. One or two Catholic "reserved teachers" there would be; but they will be allowed to give Catholic religious instruction for not more than two periods each week. For the rest, Catholic children in such a school would have religious instruction along the lines of a Protestant agreed syllabus, and presumably the "corporate act of worship" must also be broadly Protestant. Of course, should any Catholic school find itself in this predicament, all the children would be withdrawn, under the conscience clause, from the agreed syllabus instruction and the corporate act of worship, conducted in the main by non-Catholic teachers. The result would be that in any such "controlled" Catholic school there would be in practice no more religious instruction than the two hours of Catholic teaching permitted each week as a maximum. Naturally, it is unthinkable that any Catholic diocese or parish would tolerate these ridiculous and iniquitous conditions. Consequently, for Catholic schools, Mr. Butler's first alternative is ruled out.

Should the Education Bill become law in the form foreshadowed in the White Paper, Catholic schools would have to become *Aided Schools*. This would involve the finding—on a basis of voluntary contribution—of "half the cost of alterations, improvements and external repairs," the remaining half being met by the Exchequer.

This is the situation as envisaged in the White Paper. It may appear ungenerous on our part to adopt, as we have to do, the role of critic and adversary of some of its proposals, especially those which concern the future status of voluntary schools. For the general spirit of the Paper we have nothing but welcome and praise. It is certainly an attempt to improve the national standard, to provide a more genuine "equality of opportunity"; and the Paper is sensitive to the value of moral and religious factors in education. Some of its suggestions may seem a trifle unpractical, calling for adjustment. The present writer has the feeling, for example, that there will always be a certain percentage of children that definitely will not profit by the extension of the school leaving age. He has also the fear that the rapid development of secondary education may result in a process of "levelling down," particularly if political considerations be allowed to override educational realities. This is, at any rate

a danger that must be borne in mind. The somewhat sketchy paragraphs on further and adult education are very promising. It was stated during the House of Commons' debate on the Paper that some 70,000 more teachers would be required, and there were frank admissions that the quality and training of the teachers needed considerable betterment.

It is not merely a larger number of teachers that will be required but a larger number of teachers of the right calibre. It would be deplorable if the necessary corps of teachers could be obtained only at the expense of lowering existing standards. It depends almost entirely upon the quality of those who staff the schools whether the reforms proposed will be merely administrative or whether they will, in practice, work out as real educational reforms.

To return to those sections of the Paper that deal with the position of the voluntary schools. Once again, it is only fair to admit that the Paper shows a great advance upon previous Education proposals. Its general spirit is better; and it reveals an understanding of the Catholic, and generally of the denominational, position. It offers also a more generous measure of financial relief than has ever been suggested before. And yet this generosity is, in a sense, deceptive. Lord Rankeillour emphasized this matter in an admirable speech in the House of Lords. "If what used to cost £500 now costs £1,200, it is not much consolation to be told that we are to be allowed £600." The White Paper recognized the difficult situation of Catholic and other denominational authorities. In paragraph 46 it declared that it would be "beyond the financial resources of most Managers to meet unaided the bill which must be met if children in voluntary schools are not to be denied the advantages enjoyed by children in council schools." Paragraph 50 was more explicit:

It will be evident from what has been said that, under the existing law, non-provided schools will be required, if they are to continue, to shoulder a financial burden in excess of their capacity. In the first place, senior (or modern) schools will be unable to conform to the suggested policy of equal standards in all forms of secondary education. Secondly, the need for modernisation or replacement of much of the non-provided school accommodation for junior and infant children, faces the Churches with a financial problem greater in extent and no less urgent than that in respect of senior children. This is a problem which they have shown themselves quite unable to meet in recent years and which they are less than ever likely to be able to meet after the war.

Lord Rankeillour, entering into financial details in his speech, calculated that, even with the assistance offered in the White Paper, the Catholic community in this country would need to provide between six and seven million pounds as their share in the modernisation of their schools.

Lord Russell of Killowen completed this argument in the second

day of the Lords' debate. "We cannot afford it. We shall not be able to afford a vast expenditure to comply with the requirements of new buildings." The joint statement of the Catholic hierarchy, issued on August 24th, quoted an extract from a letter to the *Times* of the late Cardinal, which put the matter bluntly :

While continuing within the national system our schools should receive equal treatment with other schools, since the general demand now is that there be "equal opportunity for all." No equal opportunity will exist for a minority who are saddled with cares and crushing financial burdens because of their definite religious convictions and because they cannot accept a syllabus of religious instruction agreeable to the many.

Well, what is the real objection to this full and fair treatment of Catholic schools, to which the Cardinal refers? In the White Paper we bump continually into the Cowper-Temple clause of the 1870 Education Act. This, Mr. Butler never ventures to justify. It is accepted as a self-evident axiom; it is apparently the one principle that may not be called in question. Short of challenging this Magna Charta of ancient bigotry, Mr. Butler is ready to go a long way to help the voluntary schools. Paragraph 43, speaking of the 1870 measure, states that "in the well-known Cowper-Temple clause, this Act established the principle that tenets distinctive of particular religious denominations should not be taught in publicly provided schools." Paragraph 45 remarks that the terms of the 1902 Act aroused strong opposition, "on the ground that public funds . . . were in effect being used to subsidise the propagation of the dogmas of particular churches, thus violating the spirit of the Cowper-Temple clause." Two pages later, paragraph 54, after dismissing the Scottish solution as unworkable in England and Wales, declares that "it is clear that the solution must take different lines here and cannot ignore the principle embodied in the Cowper-Temple clause of the 1870 Act and firmly rooted in the convictions of many elements in this country that the State, concerned though it is to ensure a sound religious basis, cannot take on itself the full responsibility for fostering the teaching of formularies distinctive of particular denominations designed to attach children to particular worshipping committees."

Now, let us be honest about this Cowper-Temple business. When the question was first mooted in 1902 of allowing some financial assistance to the voluntary schools, the cry was raised of "Rome on the rates"; there was no objection, as Lord Russell of Killowen has pointed out, to Rome being on the rate-book. He observed that there have been many changes for the better since those days of bitter controversy, "but apparently, according to the White Paper, the one mentality that must survive is 'Rome on the rates.' That is the one mentality that cannot be got rid of." The tragedy, of course, is that under this mentality, despite all the welcome talk about religious

values in the national life, it is the seriously Christian schools, in which religion is the inspiration and guiding spirit, that are penalised. Those who are content with an agreed syllabus or with undenominational Christian teaching, are fully provided for. Why, in the name of anything that can be deemed Christian, should they object to Catholics enjoying similar advantages in a matter in which the most sacred demands of their conscience are at stake? Besides, what are these "public funds," available for the agreed syllabus schools but open to voluntary schools, only with severe restrictions? Reference is glibly made to them as though every grant made from them were a piece of Governmental generosity. They are the resources made available through rates and taxes; and to these resources Catholics contribute their quota like all other members of the community. Finally, Mr. Butler argues that the principle embodied in the Cowper-Temple legislation is "firmly rooted in the convictions of many elements in this country." There is another conviction just as firmly rooted in many British minds, and this is that Catholics have every bit as much right as atheists, indifferentists and undenominational Christians to have their children educated according to their own conscience and convictions. The Archbishop of York, in his speech in the House of Lords, made what I consider was a highly unfortunate quotation from one of Mr. Butler's predecessors. "Minorities must suffer." That is not a principle of democracy; it is an axiom of the Socialist or the totalitarian State. Surely, one of the ideals before the minds of the Allies, in this and also in the last war, was and is that of respect for minorities, national or religious.

The general temper of the debates on the White Paper was moderate and friendly. Only one speech, that of Mr. Alexander Walkden, was truculent and unpleasant: it included an attack upon the Church in Spain, Italy and Eire and a denial of the democratic right of free associations, such as that of the religious trade unions in Canada. One or two non-Catholic members spoke with appreciation of the Catholic position. Professor Gruffydd, for example, reminded the House of Commons "of one simple fact, that Roman Catholics and many Anglicans regard the training of the young as an essential activity of the Church rather than on the State. I do not agree with that view, but it would be quite impossible for me or anyone else to say anything useful about education until we recognize that fact." Mr. Nunn, member for Newcastle-upon-Tyne, spoke as follows:

I have had, perforce, for a good many years, to come into contact a great deal with the Catholic educational system, and in doing so, not only in this country but in other parts of the world, I have secured a sound idea of how they carry out their work. I have gained a great respect for their educational work. The basis of that work is not the daily act of worship; it is the daily contact between believing master and flock.

There is a fact existing, and that fact is that the Roman Catholic community, whether they are right or wrong—I think they are right—does not like any arrangement which cuts them off from daily contact with the young members of their flock. We pride ourselves on our religious tolerance. We can argue, if we like, that the Roman Catholics should be more tolerant. I think that the Church of England and the Nonconformist bodies would be perfectly satisfied, probably, with the system of worship suggested in the White Paper. I am convinced that the Roman Catholics will not and that they will have a sense of grievance right through.

It is an indubitable fact which exists, and so long as there are Roman Catholics holding to their faith, so long will they hold that opinion and take that attitude. We may like it or not, but we cannot argue about it.

Of other speakers, Mr. Sexton, member for Barnard Castle, asserted, in the Commons :

For my part, the Scottish system would satisfy me. If we could clear away the vexed religious question as they have in Scotland, I should be satisfied. When I read the memorandum with regard to religious instruction in the schools in Scotland, which was issued this year, I did not find in it a word of complaint about the way in which they go on in Scotland. Everything seems to be going on all right, and so far as I know, Scotland is in no way behind this country in education.

The Scottish system was carefully analysed in the March-April MONTH for 1943. It was adopted after the 1914-18 war and has proved, on the whole, thoroughly satisfactory. It unified the national scheme of education but made full allowance for Catholic teachers in Catholic schools. The White Paper devotes a paragraph to this question. The beginning is spoilt by a reference to the wretched Cowper-Temple clause which seems to haunt all educational progress in England like a bogey. Afterwards, it advances the serious argument of the single-area schools. This is frankly a difficulty, and here Free Churchmen have a perfect right to urge a new arrangement. There are roughly 4,000 single-area schools, that are officially Church of England and yet to which Free Churchmen have to send their children. As a matter of fact, this problem will be solved by the general resolution of Church of England schools—after the debates in the Church Assembly—to avail themselves of the “controlled” schools provisions. But there are practically no Catholic “single-area” schools. Catholic schools are homogeneous, that is, they are schools for Catholic children. Recently, a report of a Nuffield Reconstruction Committee suggested the Scottish solution for Catholic and Jewish schools. This would allow Catholic schools to enter the national school system, with every necessary guarantee to the Local Education Authority for the efficiency of teaching on secular subjects, and at the same time it would secure to Catholics that essential direction of their own schools in a Catholic spirit which they consider absolutely necessary for education. Lord Russell of Killowen put it admirably,

during the second day of the Lords' debate, when he declared :

We want in our schools to teach our children the tremendous and solemn meaning of the Mass. We want to teach them the grace and the merits of the Sacraments. We want to teach them the faith that is in them, and the reasons for that faith ; and it should all be bound up with the education as a whole, and not be merely an isolated item in the curriculum. And, above all, we want this done by teachers who believe what they teach.

Perhaps, we might add to this some extracts from the splendid speech to the Commons of Mr. David Logan :

We do not speak as "Roman Catholics," with abbreviated titles, or italics, or inverted commas ; we speak as members of a Church that was already well known in this country when education was being given to it. If you look round, you will find that many of the places that are now in the possession of others, were ours in those days long ago. As the ancient owners of those places, we have a right to come, not cap in hand, not begging, not as friars or Ishmaels, but as Englishmen claiming equal rights with other Englishmen. If we are good enough to fight for this country, we are good enough, in a national system of education, to share equally with every other man, woman or child in the benefits which the nation gives. For the Jew, the Catholic, or the Protestant, I demand not only equality of opportunity but equality in the State ; their children should have the same chance as others have.

I never read any more ridiculous or illogical statement than the statement that if Church schools will give up their rights—because they are not able to carry out their legal obligations—they can have a reduction in their Managers and can get freedom in a national service, but that if they want to teach the faith of their fathers and to give to their children that moral environment which is essential, they are to be penalised. In other words, in a Christian land agnostics can have a school built by the State, while professing Christians, because they are not able to maintain their schools, cannot get religious teaching in schools. To me that is the most absurd thing I have ever read.

Before we finish, we should mention that the Catholic case was stated, with full historical detail, in the Commons by Sir John Shute as also by Mr. Logan. In the Lords it was admirably presented by Lords Russell of Killowen and Rankeillour. In sympathetic vein, Lord Quickswood argued against the agreed syllabus. The Bishop of Derby hinted at the dangers of State control, as did Mr. Linstead in the Commons. The Bishop of St. Albans insisted that serious Christian education could not be given except within "the environment of a worshipping, witnessing, working and fighting Christian fellowship." The official speeches of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York were disappointing.

Returning to the question of a Scottish solution for Catholics, we recall the joint statement of the Catholic hierarchy of August 24th. There they refer to past proposals made by them to the President of the Board of Education, among which are the following :

- (i) That the Scottish System, with suitable adjustments, could be applied to Catholic schools ;
- Or (ii) That for new schools we should be aided by a State loan free of interest ;
- Or (iii) That in order to remove our anxieties concerning the uncertainties of the future, our liability should be limited to a fixed maximum price per school place.

These reflections are sufficient. During the Parliamentary debates on the White Paper, the present writer was in Scotland. The whole matter was discussed, freely and frankly, in the Scottish press, not always with gentle approval of what was said in Westminster. It might not be amiss to conclude with a letter which appeared in the *Scotsman* for August 11th. It merits reproduction *in toto*. Here it is :

It is puzzling to ordinary members of the public why there should be so much controversy regarding the question of religious teaching in the schools.

The Atlantic Charter emphasizes the necessity for freedom of religion, freedom of minorities, and equal opportunities for all. When it is proposed that those people disapproving of the State ideas regarding religion should have to pay the full education rate and, in addition, should have to pay further sums to have their children educated in the environment they desire, equality of opportunity ceases to exist, as does freedom of minorities. We are fighting for these very things. It is surely unreasonable, as well as ridiculous, that our country, of all countries, should lay itself open to the accusation of failure to comply with these conditions.

An aspect of the question which does not seem to be considered is that the religious atmosphere runs through every educational subject in the Catholic schools, whereas in State schools religion is usually dealt with in a sort of hermetically sealed compartment. When religious instruction is over, religion, so to speak, ceases to exist.

A simple solution appears to be for the sum per head of all children of school age to be divided on a *per capita* basis, amongst the children of the country. There would then be the State schools for those who wished them and others for those desiring a different atmosphere, with teachers professing and practising the religion of the parents. So long as the school curriculum and other conditions come up to the required standard for all schools, there is no valid reason against this solution. It would ensure equal opportunities for all.

The Trades Union movement, for some reason, appears especially antagonistic to this solution, but is it not due to entire lack of understanding of the situation ? Those Trades Unionists not desiring their children to have Catholic influences and surroundings would deeply resent it if their children were forced into Catholic schools. Well, that being recognized, why should their views carry more weight than those of Catholics, or Jews, or members of other denominations, with regard to the environment of their children ? It is certainly neither fair nor reasonable, and is entirely contrary to the very objects for which we are fighting. I do not think the country realises what serious results would accrue if the old bitterness of years ago were revived.

JOHN MURRAY.

Lindaraxa's Garden

(A *patio* in the Alhambra.)

In Granada, by Allah's will,
An Arab, with the secret skill
And arts of Suleyman the Wise
Once conjured on a haunted hill
A palace like a paradise.
O, 'twas a rare and wondrous sight
With fairy courts and fountains springing
In those gardens of delight
Where the wild birds still are singing
Day and night.

Then the sage, with occult malice
On the portals of the palace
Carved a mystic hand and key ;
And with incantations muttered
In strange Arab cadence, uttered
Thrice the mystical decree :
Till the talismanic hand
Grasps the key upon the portal,
Against magic foe and mortal
The Alhambra still shall stand.

And the spell is still unbroken
For the talismanic token
In its mystic power is keeping
All the secrets of the sleeping
Ages that are past,—
Still its magic holds them fast.

There's a secret in the air
Of Lindaraxa's garden, where
The cypresses are slim and tall,
And orange trees, against a golden wall
With golden fruit stand laden ;
And where a fountain, like a captive maiden,
Sways in the wind and murmurs to the trees.
Here Lindaraxa wandered at her ease
And dreamed the hours away,
Watching the sunlight on the crystal spray.
Or, wearied with the day
She waited for the night as for a lover,
Reaching an arm, in play
To pluck the great, low stars that hung above her.
The silent cypress trees,—
Dark spears that point to God,—
Stand up as straight as warriors on a frieze
And guard the paths that Lindaraxa trod.
Amid the crash of war and circumstance
Each watchful, spell-bound warrior lifts his lance,—
And earth may rock, but on this hallowed hill
Silence and peace and beauty linger still.

HELEN NICHOLSON.

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

THE NEW CHINA

WE tend to forget China as our ally partly, no doubt, because China is so far away! Any European who has lived, or who has even travelled there, seems to have loved both country and people, but to most of us it is only a distant, dim landscape, a country the Screen has shown us chiefly as in the throes of famine and flood, and whose lovely art we confuse with cheap atrocities from Japan, of all places! While Russian novels had made Russia as familiar to most of us as, say, Italy or Spain, from the force of circumstances China had sent us practically no books, and certainly no tourist propaganda. Add to this that we are aware that China as it was till it woke from a dream of five thousand years, despised us as poor white trash, and we have a few ostensible reasons for our neglect.

Certain English and American novelists have not shown the same neglect; Ann Bridge, Pearl Buck and others have done much to *show* us China as far as the outsider can do it; Nora Waln, in her enchanting "The House of Exile," was able as the one girl guest admitted, and eventually adopted, into a Chinese family, to give us Chinese life in all its exclusiveness. It is none the less important that a recent book by a young Chinese author, or authors, should have achieved an almost popular success in this country. "Destination Chungking," in idiomatic English, is the enthralling story of China's effort, life and sufferings written chiefly, if not entirely, by a young woman of the New China partly educated in England. "Han Suyin" is a pen-name of Chinese symbolism—the Voice of One among the Many. "It is a war-book but it does not take you to the front line. . . . Its action takes place in the cities at the rear, among the civilian population, among families in the towns overtaken by the war. If our life involves a certain, constant threat of danger, this danger has been borne and lived with until it becomes a familiar element of everyday existence." Han Suyin does not add that her book admits us to the patriarchal private life of her people, to the enchantment and beauty of quiet country-sides, the pomp and circumstance of ancient cities, the semi-royal state of the Big Families, to much of the mystery and poetry, the art and culture of centuries.

All this is of peculiar interest to Catholics. The hopes of recent Popes for the future of the Church in China are too well known to need comment, but there is likewise a belief commonly held that the Holy See actually looks to China for the survival of Catholicism should unbelief, paganism, and a resultant return to barbarism, ever cause the Faith to perish in the West. . . . It is the quantity and quality of converts to the Church which justify the belief in China of the Holy See, the character of the people and, above all, the eminence of the Chinese clergy. Catholic missionaries have made history under the emperors of the various dynasties, and the missionaries are still there under the Republic, and in spite of all the horrors of war and the frightful devastation of churches and mission houses; it is, of course, to them that the conversion and training of the

clergy are usually due. As a practical demonstration of the result at its highest, the Chinese bishops may be cited, among whom perhaps the best-known in Europe is the very remarkable and still young Vicar Apostolic of Nankin, Monsignor Yu-Pin, whose dynamic direction of Catholic Action before the war has merged, for the time being, into a passive but stern defence of his country.

Japan's invasion of China, and conduct of the war, have been as brutal and as far-reaching as anything organized by Germany. The outbreak of war found China's people divided, bemused by years of political chaos and already wearied to death of the wars within its own borders. War Lords and political upstarts had brought China to the verge of collapse. Monsignor Yu-Pin at once mounted the breach in his vicariate; under his direction his priests worked unremittingly to stimulate energy, to encourage resistance. The generalissimo, Chiang Kai-Shek, by his genius rallied a nation; the Vicar Apostolic of Nankin had, in his measure, helped—he is not only a great churchman but a great patriot.

Converted to Catholicism when still a youth, Monsignor Yu-Pin has many of the characteristics of his great leader, Chiang Kai-Shek,—his vitality, his strength of will, his powers of getting things done. He is still only forty and was a bishop at thirty-six. His studies for the priesthood were made in Rome where later he himself taught at the College of Propaganda, for he is a scholar and a linguist familiar not only with the intricacies of his native classics, but with the English, French, German, and Italian languages (and, of course, with Latin), while he has a working knowledge of Spanish and, for severely practical purposes, of Esperanto. Back again in China his life was one of intensive apostleship, interrupted only by the war of 1937. He at once, aware of what religion might expect from the invaders, saw to it that every presbytery, and all church property, was actually fortified as far as might be. . . . Then seeing that China was going to be left to her fate, defenceless in almost everything but courage, he flew to Rome in the autumn after the outbreak of war in August, to put his country's cause before Pius XI. With the Pope's full approval he set out to try and enlist the sympathies of Europe, visiting Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, Italy, Hungary, France and England. Finally he reached America. He was going to bring home to people the fact that his homeland was being overrun by an enemy unspeakably cruel and treacherous.

China has a civilization of untold antiquity; it is, by and large, the most artistic and, in certain ways, the most cultured country in the world. It is a land where beauty, ethics and manners are supremely valued, a place of fabled interest to scholars and artists; its people are patient, honest, humorous and exceedingly clever. The rich in China lived in splendid isolation in palaces of intricate loveliness, but an idea is current that Chinese servants are slaves—they are in reality a valued part of the Big Families themselves. On great days, when the Family Ancestors are honoured, the household servants will likewise render homage to their present masters on bended knees, but these same magnificent employers will in their turn *kneel to their servants*. . . . The poor of China, alas, are terribly poor though food is daily distributed by the Big Families at their gates, but another day is dawning in the Republic for the dispossessed; the very war to-day is called *That of the Common Man*. All this, and the deadly peril of China, Monsignor Yu-Pin was going to tell Europe and America, especially America and its Catholics—they, in that great

land of liberty, would understand better than anyone. But . . . Russia had been the only country, and that intermittently, to help his homeland with arms, and American Catholics who saw in Russia only the danger of Bolshevism turned a deaf ear to and, in a sense, almost boycotted the Chinese Vicar Apostolic.

It was a profound disappointment but not one to upset Monsignor Yu-Pin. He reacted simply. What if Russia were Bolshevik! No one else had helped China in her hour of peril—in her just cause she would buy arms from *anyone*, as she had every right to do. He gave, in all, about one hundred and thirty lectures and won over his audiences, Catholic and others. Then he went back home to support to the full Generalissimo Chiang Kai-Shek who now, to all practical purposes ruled China and who, as all know, is an exemplary Christian. Whether war-conditions allow the General to keep up his daily hour's reading of the Gospels is not known, but he lives and governs by their teaching.

Han Suyin, the author of "Destination Chungking" is in her turn, another portent of the new China. What religious belief exactly she took back there from her English training is a matter of conjecture though she writes, at least at times, as a Christian. She had not, as had Madame Chiang Kai-Shek, any Christian parentage, otherwise there is a certain likeness of circumstance between the young author and the famous woman she greatly admires. Both typify in themselves, and in their education, the New Order for a most ancient civilization; both are intellectual and very feminine, brave to rashness and constitutionally delicate; both know English perfectly and appreciate western culture and customs without being drawn in the smallest degree away from their own people and their preference for China. Love of her countrymen seeps through all of Han Suyin's book; of her fellow country-women she says, in writing of Madame Chiang Kai-Shek, "Many people have written of her . . . her wit, her beauty, her poise, her patriotic devotion. Everyone has heard of her courage. . . . All the traditions of Chinese womanhood meet in her." She is the fine-flower of her nation, but, adds the author, "there are thousands, millions akin to her, women all charm and femininity without" but "with souls like steel-blades . . . the mothers and wives of China." Such a soul has Han Suyin herself.

With so much heroism goes a mildness we should like to call Christian. Before the war Han Suyin was a pacifist and, in England she "discovered" the Bible and the text "Blessed are the meek." It seemed to her the negation of war. But back in China, a year after war began, what she learnt of Japanese methods changed her ideas: "With grief, but without hate, like millions of other peace-loving Chinese, I have consented in my heart to a war of resistance against this corruption and enslavement."

When studying in England Han Suyin had, strangely enough, re-met a playmate of childish days, Pao, whom one surmises may be her fellow-writer, for in her preface she intimates she was not alone in the making of "Destination Chungking." She and Pao had "shared the same games along the banks of the canal, beneath the willow-trees, the dusty grey-green willows of Peking . . . older and taller, we were by ancient Chinese custom separated. . . . I must keep within gates, learn prim, modest ways, the deportment of a lady. Pao, at the age of 12, must enter upon the serious studies which were to prepare him for his destined place in life as a fit representative of his family. . . . Pao's house was very important, much the richest and noblest in our street. Great gates opened

upon a vista through courtyard after courtyard, spacious, imposing. Pillared pavilions supported wide roofs . . . Gold-leaf and lacquer and deep-cut carving made splendid the doors and the pillars. . . ." This great house "was in a continual state of magnificent activity. . . ." In the morning when Pao's father went out, "the mounted bodyguard would be drawn up at the gates, waiting. The Lord of the house would issue forth, take his place in his carriage and drive away, with the solemn clatter of many hoofs accompanying him." That was the Old China. Then Pao's father ended his share in it. He joined the party of Sun-Yet-Sen, the quiet medical man and revolutionary leader, who sought union for China and the end of the marauding War Lords, a union it was to take the genius of Chiang Kai-Shek to achieve. The fortunes of Pao's Big Family declined, his father had to take refuge in a distant southern province while the great house grew empty and, at last, the old gate-keeper alone wandered in the deserted courts. At 14 Pao, too, joined the party and barely escaped execution—with consummate coolness he made his escape and his way to his father in Shanghai. At seventeen he entered the Central Military Academy at Nanking created by the "revolutionists" for the training of the new, disciplined army. Later he was one of three to be chosen out of three thousand to go overseas to Sandhurst in England. His mother wished him first to be betrothed, according to Chinese custom; Han Suyin, whom he had forgotten, was one maiden whose name was put forward. But he, like Han Suyin herself, was of the new way of thinking; neither had any use for the old marriage of convenience, nor as yet for any marriage.

In the meantime Han Suyin, away at her University, had persuaded her uncle to send her abroad to complete her training; she was to serve China as a doctor. At an assembly of students in a country house in Kent she and Pao met, at first failed to recognize each other, in the end fell in love. A year later "Shanghai was lost, then Nanking was lost and the world assumed China would capitulate. Instead, we retreated still fighting . . . we entered upon the second year of the war—endurance, out-lasting the enemy,"—Pao and Han Suyin sailed in the same ship for home. When they rediscovered their own families and obtained their sanction, they decided to marry, Han Suyin "no longer a dreamy girl, but a woman ready and willing for my part in my country's ordeal." She was just twenty-one. It was September. "Peace for Our Time" had just been signed at Munich, "We snatch at the (Hong Kong) newspapers. . . . Hankow, our goal, the war-time capital, with the enemy closing in upon the High Command, upon him, the Generalissimo . . . there is a decisive battle in progress, and we are not there to share it! . . . We much reach Hankow, and quickly—or it may be too late! The way may not be open." It was not. Every plane was chartered, every train commandeered. They turned to friends. "Kinship and friendship are the double foundation stone of the Chinese social structure . . . friendship . . . kinship spun out to the most remote degree . . . we came to Hong Kong as strangers in a strange city (a grey old Victorian business centre . . . grafted upon a maze of Chinese streets, gaudy and cluttered) and friends cropped up, as if by magic, everywhere." One of the Big Family, once a rich man, now living in two rooms on secret service for his country, after unending trouble got them places on "probably the last" train going through. On the second evening they arrived at a junction and should have reached Hankow in a few hours—it took

four more days. All around was "grey with soldiers, asleep on the platform or on the bare earth of the fields. . . . Waiting with patience. Many had bandages, once white, now earth-stained, blood-stained . . . the walking wounded," they had been in the battle where "the Japanese had everything—tanks, planes, heavy artillery, superior equipment. But we had stood them off for ten months. These men would be back in the lines again after a rest." Two nights were spent in the station, alerts sounding, food soon exhausted, and water too. Trains and trains went through, cattle-trucks filled with refugees standing so densely packed they could not move a hand, "with drawn faces, in rags, dirty and thin, clutching their pathetic possessions, tied in bundles . . . they are like dumb suffering animals . . . past emotion, centred upon one terrific effort of endurance . . . this is the reality behind the news reports in England, in Hong Kong. . . . We can only clench our hands and watch the passing of our people, fleeing from their devastated farms and villages, homeless. Pao's lips are set in that grim expression. . . ."

Hankow, the great industrial area of Central China, was then the last stand of the China they had known. The enemy was approaching but the people would not believe anything could happen to Hankow . . . Pao reported to GHQ. and was attached to the Staff on account of his knowledge of languages—a disappointment as that was behind the fighting line; Han Suyin joined the hospital. At a great evening procession they saw Chiang Kai-Shek. "Out of the car stepped a lean, uniformed figure . . . A severely simple uniform without decorations, a face serene in the moon-light and torch-light. . . . As the crowd became aware of him there was a murmur, then silence, then a roar. . . . Generalissimo! Ten thousand years!" It was there they were married, by candle-light by a Christian minister who presented each of them with a small Bible. During the wedding-feast Pao had orders to report to Marshal Pai Chung-hsi "across the Yangtze and miles beyond" before dawn. Hankow had to be evacuated; the Generalissimo would stand for no useless massacre of his countrymen, they were too badly armed.

By slow stages Pao moved with the High Command to its ultimate destination, Chungking. To us that suggests a progress of camouflaged cars, of lorries with luggage, of ubiquitous orderlies, but conditions, anyhow for the juniors, were desperate. Han Suyin, for a time was with her husband. At one place they lived in a derelict hotel "with walls and a roof" in a room up a ladder stair-case with no glass in the windows and a floor with holes into the room below. Every morning the population streamed out to the hill-sides, returning at night when the Japanese bombers had gone. That place—Nanyu—, too, was evacuated and the trek began again; terrible days in a munition wagon already so filled with human beings that it had seemed impossible to find a crevice between them and crates, saddles and metal cases; on station platforms and roadsides in streaming rain, waiting for buses and trains that never came; nights on the bare boards of school-houses and, once, in a lean-to from which the cries of a fellow traveller reached Han Suyin in the night; by the light of a candle, kneeling on the bare earth of a tool-shed, she helped bring into the world a tiny premature baby. . . . Five mortal days and nights they spent in a train, eighty-seven of them sandwiched together in one car. The traditions of Chinese civilization helped them through, "enduring thirst, stench, crowding, lack of sleep, yet preserving courtesy towards each other, exchanging jokes and in general behaving as though

we were on a pleasure excursion. Courtesy is, I think, one of the highest virtues in time of stress, the pattern of decorum that is so emphasized in Chinese tradition. . . . We smile and bow and murmur the prescribed polite phrases, and miraculously the thousand annoyances of our environment melt away." They talked, and of the war, but "never once was Japan reviled." For all the unspeakable outrages of Japan no threat of vengeance was harboured, "only a conviction, a sure belief that these atrocities stem from something in Japanese character and outlook, a fundamental immorality, and because of this decadence of character the Japanese are doomed. They can not win the war. They can not endure. They lack the stability that inheres in Chinese traditions of family and home."

It is that stability and the heroism typified by all Han Suyin records when later she rejoined her husband at Chungking, from which the war is being won for China—and her allies. She and he had been separated for a year during which we learn so much of other aspects of Han Suyin's native land, alternations of happy home life and the horrors of invasion. Chungking, when she reached it, had been "bombed almost daily . . . destroyed and rebuilt, smashed and the fragments put together again. . . . The Japanese . . . seemed to have an obsession in regard to Chungking; it was as though the continued existence of life upon that rocky spur between the rivers was an insult to (Japan's) might." "Five hundred thousand still lived there . . . they stoically adapted themselves to the terror and discomfort and refused to abandon their city." In the refuge where Han Suyin rejoined her husband the windows were blank holes, in the back room two walls were gone and a large part of the ceiling. "In our good room there were a table, a stool, a broken chair and a narrow bed." Almost speechless with joy at their reunion, the pair were sitting side by side on the narrow bed, "It was then that (their) ceiling came down. . . ."

But what of that? "We have lost proud and stately cities. The earth drinks the blood of our dead. The smoke of our burning homes is black and tawny against the sky. But . . . China is not lost . . . where there is an indomitable heart, there is China, unconquerable. This truth is her invisible strength, a thing more concrete than the steel of guns and the stone of fortifications. It exists, this secret power, unlinked to any specific city, harbour, mountain or river."

All this is true, but O. M. Green, the distinguished authority on China, wrote recently that the Chinese believe that London and Washington "still do not fairly appreciate what China has done or could do with more help . . . it would be dangerous to think that China, so to speak, will always be there when we are ready to help her." . . .

MRS. GEORGE NORMAN.

EDITORIAL NOTE

All contributions submitted to the Editor must be typed and be accompanied by a sufficiently large stamped addressed envelope—stamps (or Post Office coupons from abroad) alone will not suffice. Articles so submitted should be concerned with matters of general interest, and be the fruit of expert knowledge or original research. They should not ordinarily exceed 3,000 words, and must be intended for exclusive publication in the "Month," if accepted.

Literary Communications, Exchanges, and Books for Review should be addressed to The Editor of "The Month," 114 Mount Street, London, W.1, and not to the Publishers: Business Communications to The Manager, Manresa Press, Roehampton, London, S.W.15.

II. OUR CONTEMPORARIES

- AMERICA : July 24th, 1943. **Anglo-American Relations**, by Robert C. Hartnett, S.J. [Has some friendly remarks on the difference of the British and American outlook and concludes with the question, "If Americans cannot get along with the British, with whom can they get along?"]
- BLACKFRIARS : July, 1943. **Father Vincent McNabb : Memorial Number**. [A well deserved tribute from many pens to the character and work of the late Father McNabb, O.P.]
- BROTÉRIA : June, 1943. **As Directrizes de Salazar**. [This Portuguese monthly gives us the full text of an important address by Dr. Salazar that was both a declaration of principles and a review of fifteen years of national effort.]
- CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW : July, 1943. **Bishop Bruté's Report to Rome in 1836**. [A full and interesting analysis of Catholicism in one part of the United States a century ago, with notes on contemporary Protestantism.]
- COMMONWEAL : July 16th, 1943. **The World After**, by George N. Shuster. [An American writer argues that, if we can muster "the sobriety, the firmness and the intelligent industry to see human society through the suffering of the post-war years . . . we can create a century of progress for mankind."]
- EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY : Jan.-June, 1943. **The Missionary Expansion of the Russian Orthodox Church**, by Nadejda Gorodetzky. [Containing an interesting account, from an Orthodox source, of Christian missionary work in Siberia and Kazan during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and its revival after 1850.]
- HOMILETICAL AND PASTORAL REVIEW : August, 1943. **Less Catechism : More Religion**, by the Right Rev. Mgr. M. A. Schumacher. [Some practical hints, addressed to priests and teachers, for enlivening the teaching of Catechism.]
- IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD : August, 1943. **Co-operative Credit Societies**, by Rev. C. Lucey. [A plea for co-operative societies in Irish life, with the warning that such societies cannot rise higher than the motives and actions of the people who compose them.]
- JESUIT MISSIONS : July-August, 1943. **Native Priests To-day and To-morrow**, by Joseph M. Lynch. [The article touches upon a subject very dear to recent Popes and points to what has been achieved in Africa and in the Philippines.]
- TABLET : August 21st and Sept. 4th, 1943. **Our Power and Our Policy**, and **The English Tradition and Europe**. [Two very timely editorials which emphasize : firstly, that, in the eyes of many European nations, our handling of Italy is a test-case, a measure of our European statesmanship even more than of our military power ; secondly, that the character of Europe is well established and should be well known, and that among other things it is profoundly opposed to totalitarian Socialism.]
- THEOLOGICAL STUDIES : June, 1943. **Interredal Co-operation in the Papal Documents**, by Wilfrid Parsons, S.J. **Interredal Co-operation : Its Theory and Organization**, by John Courtney Murray, S.J. [Two admirable articles that will be of great assistance to all who are engaged in, or interested in, co-operation with non-Catholics.]

REVIEWS

SPIRITUAL EXPERIENCES¹

IN *Midnight Hour*, a very moving spiritual journal, Nicodemus recorded a profound religious experience. Poignantly and vividly there came to him the realisation of the fact of evil, of the grandeur of God, of human impotence and dependence upon God, of the way of regeneration through suffering and "self-naughting"—an awareness of the strait way in which alone a man can be saved and our world also saved from the hell we have ourselves made.

This evil "at the core" strikes at the roots of life, of all romanticism, evolutionism, utopianism; making futile our art and scholarship, since "why evolve, why fashion beauty, why search for truth, why breed, why live at all, if always and everywhere this maggot corruption eats at the vitals of all we do or dare?" Only by Christ, and through the pattern of the cross, can this evil be overcome; the law is death first, and thereafter, life. Through this pattern of the cross man is purged, his life is uplifted, and his personality developed to its full stature. Such has been the experience of Nicodemus in prayer and meditation and inward agony of spirit.

In cooler and more reflective mood, viewing the problems raised by his experience from many angles, the anonymous author of *Midnight Hour* now contributes an interpretation or rationalisation of his intuition. *Renascence* leads this questing mind through Mr. T. S. Eliot's "nether world" of consciousness and Dr. Martin Buber's "World of Thou," to the significance of tradition and the study of personality. In the process are probed the foundations of Renaissance art, the problems of tragedy, the mysteries of wisdom, both pagan and Christian, and also of Salisbury and the downland spring. And always there emerges the selfsame pattern—regeneration through death into life—the pattern of the cross. This fundamental law of Being springs from faith in transcendent Spirit and, for Nicodemus, provides that basis of universal faith common, he declares, "to all revealed religion, to all the enduring wisdom of mankind, and, whether consciously or unconsciously, to the majority of men of good will everywhere and at all times," and without which there can be no community of men, no peace, no enduring world order, since for any planning, there must be pattern; and pattern is not imposed, but must emerge, and the pattern that emerges is the pattern of the cross, faith in transcendent Being and Law, in dying to live, in reborn personality.

That this federal or fundamental faith, while not itself full Christianity, leads to and, indeed, involves Incarnational Christianity, is clearly recognized. But Nicodemus would have the real and whole-hearted Christian go out and meet his fellow-man "upon the circumference of an orb of faith in Being of which the core remains an undiluted Christianity."

Many are the pages of great interest, of delicate perception and poetic insight in these volumes; there are pages also of scathing indictment of complacent religiosity. However, some passages appear to deny that

¹ *Midnight Hour*. Pp. 177. Price: 8s. 6d. n. *Renascence*. Pp. 162. Price: 8s. 6d. n. Both works by Nicodemus. London: Faber and Faber. 1943.

very transcendence of Spirit which the author is at such pains to defend. The note of pantheism is not sufficiently excluded. Is it not an oversimplification to proclaim the United Nations as protagonists of this fundamental faith in Spirit and the values of Spirit? Is it not also somewhat foolish to imagine that, without its embodiment in institutional religion—and that, in its last resort, the Catholic Church—so fluid a foundation would ever support that building of the Community which is the Body of Christ?

G.B.W.

THE ENGLISH CARMELITES¹

MR. SHEPPARD has provided us with a very readable account of the Carmelites in English history, particularly in their heyday, from the mid-thirteenth century to the Tudor period. In his preface he admits his indebtedness to a great scholar, the late Father Benedict Zimmermann, O.D.C. "who by very great assistance rendered to me in the initial stages of gathering information, and his unfailing kindness and encouragement and continual readiness to answer questions on obscure points, enabled me to produce this small book."

The story of the English Carmelites opens with the return from the Holy Land, in 1241, of Richard, Earl of Cornwall, Henry III's brother. With him he brought back a colony of hermits who had been living on Mount Carmel. Within a few years they had made four foundations in England: at Hulne, near Alnwick, at Bradmer in Norfolk, in the Kentish Aylesford, and at Newenden, near Hastings. Tradition has it that the Hulne priory was the earliest of the four. The first General Chapter, held in Europe outside the Holy Land, met at Aylesford, in 1247. St. Simon Stock was elected Prior General and, though very little is known about his life, it is clear that he quite transformed the character and work of the English Carmelites, receiving from Pope Innocent IV a modified rule which permitted the establishment of convents.

Progress in England was rapid during the thirteenth century. There were foundations in many centres; those of Oxford and London were especially famous. The Carmelite *studium* at Oxford produced scholars and theologians, among them John Walsingham who was summoned to Avignon by Pope John XXII to defend Catholic teaching against the attacks of William Ockham. A pupil of Walsingham was John Baconthorpe who taught in Paris and was given the sturdy appellation of *Doctor Resolutus*. The London Whitefriars became an important house. It was in Fleet Street, within the domain of the Knights Templars, and we read that John Lufken, Lord Mayor of London in 1350, gave the friars a lane that ran down from Fleet Street to the Thames, in order that they might construct the west end of a larger church. Perhaps the best known of the medieval Carmelites in England was Thomas Netter, whom Henry V sent on an embassy to the king of Poland and who assisted Henry at his death and preached the funeral oration at Westminster on November 6th, 1422. Netter's work *Doctrinale Fidei Ecclesiae* is frequently referred to by St. Robert Bellarmine in his *Controversies*.

Then came the sixteenth century, when there is evidence of serious decline.

¹ *The English Carmelites*. By Lancelot C. Sheppard. London: Burns, Oates. Pp. viii, 115. Price: 6s. n. 1943.

There is no Carmelite martyr on the list of the English Beati, though Laurence Cooke, who was Prior of Doncaster at the time of the Pilgrimage of Grace, is among the *praetermissi*. The last Provincial, John Bird, was very accommodating. He wrote a treatise in favour of Henry VIII's divorce, took the oath of Supremacy and became in turn, suffragan bishop of Llandaff and bishop of Bangor. Under Mary, he recanted and is found as a suffragan to Bishop Bonner in London.

A Carmelite mission, which had accepted the reforms and spirit of St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross, worked in England from 1615 to 1849; it never included more than 16 priests at one time, and often had only four or five. In 1862, a new mission of Discalced Carmelites came to England, on the invitation of Cardinal Wiseman, and the well-known Kensington church is due to the energy of its leader, Father Augustine Mary. Father Augustine Mary's original name had been Hermann Cohen; he had studied music under Liszt, was converted in 1847, and entered the Carmelite novitiate two years subsequently. Later O.D.C. foundations are at Wincanton in Somerset (1881) and Gerrard's Cross, Buckinghamshire (1913). The Calced Carmelites, from the Irish Province, have taken over the parishes of Faversham and Sittingbourne (1926), and Hartley (1939), all in Kent, and they opened a college at Aberystwyth in 1936.

Mr. Sheppard's book concludes with a short account of the Carmelite nuns—a theme that is more fully developed in Sister Anne Hardman's "The English Carmelites in Penal Times"—and with a brief note on the Carmelite Liturgy, still observed by the Calced Carmelites, and also on the general spirit of the Carmelite Order. The book is clear and well-written; it makes a distinct contribution to an aspect of English religious life that is all too little known. There is a charming reproduction of a "Carmelite in His Study" as frontispiece and on the dust cover.

BACK TO OUR MOUNTAINS¹

WHATEVER Mr. Lunn gives us is certain to be crisp and coloured and frequently eloquent—whether he is dealing with controversy, Spain or skis. This time he celebrates a "golden jubilee," that of his first visit to Grindelwald. He had hoped to keep the jubilee in Grindelwald, and one feature was to have been a long-promised banquet in the Bear. Mr. Lunn's earliest memory is of the great fire which destroyed the old Bear and half the village besides. But—alas—there was no 1942 jubilee in Grindelwald, and, even had there been, the Bear could not have figured in it for it too was burnt in January, 1941.

The old Bear was associated with the golden age of mountaineering, the new Bear with the golden age of ski-ing; and the new Bear, like the old, has refused to survive the age of which it was a symbol.

You guess already that this is a nostalgic book. It is the handbook for those whose hearts are aching for the *neiges d'antan*, the testament of all who feel the pang of being parted from the mountains of the Alps. Mr. Lunn knows those mountains as few Englishmen know or have known them. He reminds us that, between 1892 and 1940, when France fell,

¹ *Mountain Jubilee*. By Arnold Lunn. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode. Pp. xii, 287. Price: 15s. n. 1943.

he missed only two summers, and between 1899 and 1940, only two winters in the Alps. Even the 1914-1918 war did not interrupt this sequence for he was "rejected by the Army and found work in Switzerland." More than any other Englishman, is he responsible for the development of British ski-ing and down-hill racing. Yes, it is certainly a book for those who have caught something of the fascination of mountains.

The earlier chapters are autobiographical. The story of the Lunn family is partially retold. Soon we switch to Arnold and his growing contacts with mountains and mountaineers. There is a chapter on "Alpine Mysticism and 'Cold' Philosophy" that is worth reflection. He steers a middle way between the theories of Ruskin, in whose eyes mountaineers were like bears on soaped poles and the vague pantheistic talk of other individuals, in which "mystic" is all too frequently confused with "misty." Mr. Lunn rightly invokes Mr. Belloc, with his suggestion that mountain climbing makes communion "between that homely creeping part of me which loves vineyards and dances and slow movement among pastures, and that other part which is only properly at home in Heaven." I suspect, however, that Mr. Lunn is a far better mountaineer than ever was Mr. Belloc. This chapter concludes with the following paragraph:

It is foolish to invite the ridicule of the discerning by making claims for mountaineering which cannot be substantiated. Mountaineering is neither a substitute for religion nor a civic duty. It is a sport; for we climb, not to benefit the human race, but to amuse ourselves. In so far as mountaineering is something more than a sport we must base this claim on the fact that it is carried out in surroundings which suggest spiritual truths even to the unspiritual. Ruskin compared mountains to cathedrals, and the comparison is sound; for one does not worship cathedrals, though one may worship in the cathedrals of man or among the cathedrals of nature.

There are admirable chapters in the book—about the development of British ski-ing, of the happy, and later the less happy, meetings between European countries, of Mr. Lunn's stand against Nazi-ism in Olympic Games, about the legendary Edward Whymper, whom Mr. Lunn judges more critically than did Frank Smythe. This is a rambling, roaming book, but the scenery through which it rambles and roams is more than lovely. It includes seventeen beautiful photographs.

I received the book on a hot August day, when the air was sweltering. The sight of the glacier on its dust cover did me good at once. There are times when we simply have to escape from the war and the war-atmosphere, if only for a few hours. I cannot imagine a pleasanter avenue of escape than that so providently provided by Mr. Arnold Lunn.

MR. SUMNER WELLES ON FREEDOM¹

MR. SUMNER WELLES has for a long time been Under-Secretary of State to Mr. Cordell Hull. Consequently the record of twelve of his official speeches is a valuable indication of the American outlook on current problems.

The first of these addresses was delivered in September, 1939. It was

¹ *The World of the Four Freedoms*. By Sumner Welles. New York: Columbia University Press. Pp. x, 121. Price: \$1.75. 1943.

concerned with American neutrality. Actually it was a speech to the Foreign Ministers of all American Republics at Panama and the main theme was common measures to keep the war from the American Continent. Between this date and the date of the next address, nearly two years afterwards, Mr. Sumner Welles's thought has travelled far. But, even in 1939, he had insisted that "the only possible road for achieving peace is through co-operation; this implies the juridic equality of every nation and the acceptance of a moral order and of effective international law."

He has strong things to say: of the idealist who degenerates into the pacifist: and also of the cynic and defeatist. Speaking on October 7th, 1941, before America's entry into the war, he declared:

I cannot resign myself to that admission of human incapacity—I cannot concede the inability of man to shape his destiny, under divine guidance, into something better than the kind of world in which we now live—I cannot believe that a world of order, of security, and of peace may not be realized, provided those responsible for its planning are willing to make the sacrifices required and are able to construct its foundations upon the rock of right, of justice, and of scientific truth, rather than upon the sands of selfishness, of compromise, and of expediency.

He has equally strong words about the blinkered American policy of the between-war years, both politically and in the realm of economics. Far too little attention, he considers, has been given in the U.S.A. to the vital American obligation to assist Europe in the maintenance of its varied national economies. Still looking backwards, he dismisses the "shibboleth of classic neutrality," for "there can no longer be any real neutrality as between the powers of evil and the forces that are struggling to preserve the rights and the independence of free peoples. It is far better for any people to strive gloriously to safeguard its independence; it is far better for any people to die, if need be, in the battle to save its liberties, than by clinging to the tattered fiction of an illusory neutrality, succeed only by so doing in committing suicide." And yet it needed this war, and the continued and heroic stand of Britain, to prove this attitude to the world.

Turning futurewards, he lays down the American conditions for the immediate post-war period. These include: victory over the evil men and their evil systems—Justice done, inexorably and swiftly, "to those individuals, groups and peoples, as the case may be, that can truly be held accountable for the stupendous catastrophe into which they have plunged the human race"—the disarmament of aggressive nations—an establishment of an international police power until something more permanent can be established—finally:

That the United Nations become the nucleus of a world organization of the future to determine the final terms of a just, an honourable, and a durable peace to be entered into after the passage of the period of social and economic chaos which will come inevitably upon the termination of the present war and after the completion of the initial and gigantic task of relief, of reconstruction, and of rehabilitation which will confront the United Nations at the time of the armistice.

The economic problem of the post-war years, he declares, is not that of production; for the world can readily produce what mankind requires—

a remarkable admission of God's Providence, all too easily set aside in such discussions. Finally, Mr. Sumner Welles gives us a blueprint for peace. He concludes with the following words of President Roosevelt: "We shall win this war, and in Victory, we shall seek not vengeance, but the establishment of an international order in which the spirit of Christ shall rule the hearts of men and women."

All who would understand the American outlook are advised to study these addresses. They are presented with lucidity and a vigorous crispness. And Mr. Sumner Welles is writing with authority.

SHORT NOTICES

PRESENT DAY PROBLEMS

Colonel Egerton's booklet, with the title of **Reaction, Revolution or Re-birth** (W. S. Cowell, Ipswich, 2s. 6d. n.), is well and lucidly written and contains some good sound argument. The author emphasizes our danger, namely that, while we know what we are fighting against, we are all too vague about what we are fighting for, and that, while we talk in Christian terminology, we have lost for the most part the only solid foundation that can give such terminology its real meaning. American Big Business and Russian Communism, he argues, will have much to say in the peace settlement; and they will be quite clear what they want to say. Can we make the same claim—as a people? Colonel Egerton insists upon certain *imperatives*: first of all, the recognition of the supremacy of the spiritual which will involve an acceptance of the moral law in all human relationships; then, on the politico-economic plane, a national solidarity so that national interests take precedence of individual interests, and organisation for this service of the nation. Our notions too of democracy must be reviewed; "the three great desiderata of authority, order and justice" can be realised only within the framework of an "organic democracy"; this demands the creation of an élite. Here the author is in agreement with Professor Nicholas Murray Butler who wrote in a recent work that "the chief business of democracy is to produce its own aristocracy. That is the way in which democracy discovers those who are most competent to render it important and responsible service. That democracy will be most secure and most likely to last which can and does produce this aristocracy of its own and is guided by it." Finally, Colonel Egerton glances at the Portuguese experiment. This he does not propose as a "blue-print" or model for other countries but he would at least claim that attention is given in Portugal to the ideas he is outlining.

How simply and pungently Mr. Sheed can put things? In a short handbook, entitled **Man: The Forgotten** (Sheed & Ward, 1s. n.), he confronts readers with what he declares to be the most practical question of all questions, namely What is Man? What is this creature whose welfare is continually being discussed, for whose future so much is being planned, often in contrary senses? Clear and crisp come Mr. Sheed's replies. Man—a thinking animal, a social animal, a moral animal. The moral law is the code of our Maker's instructions for the proper running and functioning of the human machine. An immoral or a-moral life is against the human grain; only through law, and through this

moral law, can man achieve genuine freedom. Hitler's assault upon Man has called the bluff of the materialist for, on his presuppositions, there is no answer to Hitler's challenge.

In **Leadership for Women** (*The Grail*, 1s. n.) we have full notes of a series of talks given by Mgr. Vance to young women who were training to be "leaders." Dr. Vance at first wanted to re-write the notes, "as the jottings of extempore talks might seem too casual." But no, his audience would not have it; they wanted the notes as they stood, with just that liveliness and concision which re-writing might have lost. The notes are admirable; they embrace subjects like the qualities requisite for leadership, hints on Honour and character, advice about being petty-minded and over-doing the detail, and about swank and spleen. The notes emphasize the need for sincere and balanced self-understanding. Be sincere with yourself, and you'll begin to be desirable as a leader of others. Miss Pauline Gower contributes an appreciative foreword. We are glad to learn that the book is proving extremely popular with the women in the Forces and with the officers of the pre-Service training organizations: it should help them.

HISTORICAL

In publishing **The Rumanian Church**, (3s. 6d. n.), by Marcu Beza, the S.P.C.K. has added another little volume to a series designed to give English Churchmen a knowledge of the various Eastern Churches. In some fifty pages, the author, himself an Orthodox, rapidly sketches the ecclesiastical history of his people. Most space is given to those periods when the Orthodox community enjoyed the patronage of devout and wealthy princes. In chronicling their munificence, the author is led to describe some of the outstanding works of art preserved in Rumania. He dwells with especial pleasure on the institutions at Mount Athos and elsewhere that testify to the spread of Rumanian piety beyond the frontiers of the kingdom. He indicates more briefly the effect of foreign influences upon Church life at home. In this connection Catholic readers will have cause to wish that the author had been able to write in more temperate terms of the Latins and of the Papacy in particular; but they will learn from his book something of the ancient customs and present outlook of a people who for long centuries have manned one of the outposts of Christendom.

ASCETICAL

Father Corbishley's little book, **What is Purity?** (Manresa Press, 6d. n.) deserves a wide reading public. In form, it is an imaginary dialogue between a discerning priest and a young man who comes to consult him and stays to supper. Pleasantly and almost casually the young man's difficulties are brought to light and solved; and he goes away, with some sound ideas on the Difficult Commandment that will cleanse his mind from scruples and undue worries and let him face temptations, when they do come, with a clear outlook and with courage. Father Corbishley deals with a young man's problems sanely and sympathetically, at the same time making all the necessary distinctions. The booklet does not confine itself to a negative and defensive attitude; it treats not only of the dangerous and the forbidden but also of what is positive and should be envisaged as an ideal. The general tone is consoling and calm. An admirable

booklet that should be widely distributed to young men and women—in sodalities, in clubs and among members of H.M. Forces.

Miss Caryll Houselander is well-known as a writer of articles and stories in the Catholic press. In **Defences of the Mind** (*The Grail*, 1s. n.) she argues that "to-day, the mind of man is assailed as never before, and never before has it been so dangerously undefended." To counter this assault we require, she insists, a technique for thinking; there is no attitude of mind more fatal than that so often heard, namely that "it is better not to think." Several of the 24 short chapters in this book come from an already published book, *This War is the Passion* (it was reviewed in the MONTH for March-April, 1943); the remainder have previously appeared in the *GRAIL* Magazine. A well-composed and useful handbook.

VERSE

Here in **Milestones** is a further sheaf of poems, from the pen of Captain Jack Gilbey. The volume is obtainable from Burns and Oates, at the price of 5s. n. The author's themes are the simple religious themes, familiar to the Catholic, and the moments of life that are heavy-laden with problems and sorrows. A spirit of quiet restful faith hovers over these short verses, and they are lit from within by a devotion that is genuine and yet restrained. The Archbishop of St. Andrews and Edinburgh, in a preface, expresses the hope that "the simple words of this booklet" may bring "simple souls nearer to the Source of all simplicity," and give comfort and strength to many a soul that is shaken and worried to-day. Several of the poems have a direct musical appeal, and some of them might well be set to music.

BIOGRAPHICAL

THERE are in Miss Monro's studies in sanctity a freshness of approach and an actuality that are not only engaging in themselves but make them most profitable spiritual reading. The older tradition of hagiography was based upon the historical method. The modern manner is rather an interpretation of character, with the consequent danger of obscuring the supernatural. A new method adopted by Miss Monro is founded upon the older tradition but it views the Saint concerned more in relationship with the whole course of history and the social background in terms of "function." Her **Book of Unlikely Saints** (Longmans, 7s. 6s. n.) provides God's criticism upon the doings of men. These saints stand in relation to a wrong or to wrongs committed by other persons. Their function may be to restore a lost moral equilibrium for the sake of the whole community, to correct an erroneous tendency, or to give encouragement and aid to souls in conflict with intolerable conditions. The examples of holiness which she chooses are modern, and the note of their modernity is an insistent recall to repentance in a complacent world that is losing sight of God and the sense of sin. They are the Penitent Innocents. They draw our attention away from exaggerated individualism to human solidarity. Their rôle is to prepare the soil by expiation. Miss Monro shows us how the lives of these saints cast light upon the mystery of suffering, help us to see meaning in what might have seemed to be meaningless, and give us encouragement in facing its grim problems.